



# **No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

**Consolidated Application  
Under Section 9302 of the  
Elementary and Secondary Education Act**

**<<http://www.doe.state.in.us/esea> >**

The Indiana Department of Education has developed this preliminary consolidated application based on the requirements in the May 6, 2002 Federal Register.

**Submitted to U.S. Department of Education  
June 12, 2002**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Consolidated State Application– Signature Page .....	5
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants .....	6
ESEA Programs Included in the Consolidated Application .....	7
SEA Contacts for ESEA Programs .....	8
 <b>PART I: ESEA Goals, ESEA Indicators, State Performance Targets .....</b>	 <b>9</b>
 <b>PART II: State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs</b>	
1. Description of the State’s system of standards, assessments, and accountability and evidence that it meets the requirements of the ESEA.	
a. Content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics Grades 3-8 .....	11
b. Content standards in science .....	11
c. Development and implementation of assessments .....	11
d. Academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, & science .....	13
e. How State calculated its “starting point” for adequate yearly progress .....	13
f. State’s definition of adequate yearly progress .....	14
g. Minimum number of students to yield statistically reliable information for subgroups ...	14
h. How State will implement a single accountability system for all schools .....	14
i. Languages present in the student population assessed .....	15
j. Annual assessment of English language proficiency .....	16
k. Standards and objectives related to English language proficiency .....	16
2. Process for awarding competitive subgrants for programs listed below and descriptions of how the State will address individual program:	
a. Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B) .....	16
b. Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C) .....	19
c. Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk–Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart2) .....	20
d. Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F) .....	22
e. Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund–subgrants to eligible partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3) .....	38
f. Enhanced Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D) .....	39

g. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, section 4112) .....	41
h. Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126) .....	42
i. 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B) .....	43
3. How the State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance .....	49
4. Statewide system of support under section 1117 .....	53
5. Description of activities the State will conduct to:	
a. Help Title I schools make effective use of schoolwide programs .....	57
b. Ensure that all teachers are highly qualified .....	60
c. Ensure that all paraprofessionals attain required qualifications .....	65
d. Help LEAs with a high need for technology form partnerships .....	66
e. Promote parental and community participation in schools .....	67
f. Secure the baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system described in Part I .....	70
6. Description of coordination with Governor's office, State-level activities, organizations, agencies, and other Federal programs	
a. SEA officials and staff consulted with the Governor's office in the development of the State plan .....	71
b. State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-Funded programs with State-level activities the State administers. ....	72
c. State officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, and nonprofit organizations .....	73
d. State officials and staff will coordinate with other agencies, including the Governor's office, and with other Federal programs .....	75
7. Description of the strategies the State will use to determine whether LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting goals, and the actions the State will take to determine or revise interventions for those not making AYP .....	76

### **PART III: ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information**

1. Title I, Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs .....	78
2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3—Even Start Family Literacy .....	79

3. Title I, Part C—Education of Migrant Children .....	83
4. Title I, Part D—Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk .....	89
5. Title I, Part F—Comprehensive School Reform .....	90
6. Title II, Part A—Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund .....	93
7. Title II, Part D—Enhanced Education Through Technology .....	94
8. Title III, Part A—English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement .....	96
9. Title IV, Part A—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities .....	98
10. Title IV, Part A, Subpart I, Section 4112(a)—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor .....	100
11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Section 4126—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants .....	100
12. Title IV, Part B—21st Century Community Learning Centers .....	100
13. Title V, Part A—Innovative Programs .....	101
14. Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111—State Assessments Formula Grants .....	103
15. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2—Rural and Low-Income School Program .....	103

## State Educational Agency

1. GEPA 427 .....	105
2. Consolidated Administrative Funds .....	105
3. Transferability .....	105
4. Assurances	
a. General and Cross-Cutting Assurances .....	106
b. Certification of Compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements .....	107
c. ESEA Program Specific Assurances .....	107

## Appendices

<b>Appendix A</b> —Application for Competitive Grants under Title VI, Subpart I, Section 6112: Enhanced Assessment Instruments (to be submitted September 15, 2002) .....	114
<b>Appendix B</b> —Indiana Department of Education Even Start FY03 Panel Review Rating Instrument .....	115
<b>Appendix C</b> —Professional Development Program Design .....	129

## INTRODUCTION


The state of Indiana, with the submission of this consolidated application for participation in programs authorized in the *No Child Left Behind* Act, is at yet another milepost in its journey to maximize the academic achievement of every Indiana student. As stated in the 2001 Annual Performance Report, entitled *The Road to World Class Education*, “In many ways, Indiana is already well on the way to improving student achievement and accountability and has made strides in other areas that are of concern to all of us, like school safety, high academic standards, character education, and effective and efficient use of resources.” A number of provisions of the *No Child Left Behind* Act intersect with the intent of Indiana’s recent accountability legislation, Public Law 221, and with education aims adopted by the State Board of Education. The aims, proposed by our Education Roundtable before their ultimate adoption by the board, are:

- ✓ **Safe and Caring Schools**
- ✓ **High Standards, Assessments, and Accountability**
- ✓ **High Performing System Preparing High Performing, Responsible, and Responsive Citizens**
- ✓ **High Student Achievement**
- ✓ **Effective Use of Resources**

The State Board is now developing state-level goals and measures supporting and aligning with the state aims for education. Superintendent of Public Instruction Suellen Reed and staff of the Indiana Department of Education are committed to implementing both the state and federal laws with a single view of the road before us—giving our schools, their teachers and students the resources and support to help them become world class. For our students to achieve at the highest levels and to grow into responsible citizens, they require schools that provide rich and rigorous instruction, based on the findings of research, and schools that offer safe learning environments for all. It is a long-standing belief of Indiana policymakers and citizens alike that highly qualified, well-trained teachers and principals are critical to continuing educational improvement. Provisions of the *No Child Left Behind* Act in many instances validate Indiana’s current education policy, so it is with the high hopes and the right spirit that our people embark on its implementation.

**CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION - SIGNATURE PAGE**

The state of Indiana hereby requests funds as authorized by section 9302 of the ESEA for the programs selected and identified on the "list of programs included in this consolidated application."

1. Legal name of Applicant Agency (State Educational Agency): Indiana Department of Education	2. D.U.N.S. number: 824799209  Taxpayer ID Number (TIN): 35-6000158
3. Address (include zip): 151 West Ohio Street Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2798	4. Contact Person for Consolidated Application Name: Linda Miller  Position: Assistant Superintendent  Telephone: 317-232-0519 Fax: 317-233-6502 E-Mail: lmiller@doe.state.in.us
5. Is the applicant delinquent on any Federal debt? <u>  X  </u> No  <u>                    </u> Yes, explanation attached.	
6. By signing this consolidated State application, the State certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the programs included in this Consolidated State Application have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the State): i. <u>Section 14303 and EDGAR.</u> The assurances in Section 9304 (a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) ii. <u>ESEA Program Assurances.</u> Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing any program included in this Application. iii. <u>Assurances and Certifications.</u> Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under "Assurances and Certifications." iv. <u>Crosscutting.</u> As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs). v. <u>Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace.</u> The three certifications in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96).) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts have changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made.	
7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certifications provided in this package if the assistance is awarded.	
a. Printed Name and Title of Authorized State/SEA Representative: Dr. Suellen Reed Superintendent of Public Instruction	b. Telephone: 317-232-6611 Fax: 317-232-8004 E-Mail: sureed@doe.state.in.us
c. Signature of Authorized State/SEA Representative: 	d. Date:  June 12, 2002

## SAFE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT STATE GRANTS

## Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet

1. Legal Name of Applicant Agency (Chief Executive Office): <b>Family Social Services Administration, Division of Mental Health and Addiction (Designated by Chief Executive Office).</b>	2. DUNS Number: <b>EIN 35-6000158</b>
3. Address (including zip code): <b>402 W. Washington W353 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2739</b>	4. Contact Person Name: <b>Sally Shearer Fleck</b> Position: <b>Chief</b> Telephone: <b>317/232-7880</b> Fax: <b>317/233-3472</b> E-Mail Address: <b>sfleck@fssa.state.in.us</b>
5. Reservation of Funds: <b>20</b> % Indicate the amount the Governor wishes to reserve (up to 20%) of the total State SDFSCA State Grant allocation.	
6. By signing this form the Governor certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the State): i. <u>Section 14303 and EDGAR</u> . The assurances in Section 9304(a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). ii. <u>ESEA Program Assurances</u> . Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program. iii. <u>Assurances and Certification</u> . Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under "Assurances and Certifications." iv. <u>Cross-Cutting</u> . As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs.)v. <u>Lobbying, debarment/suspension, drug-free workplace</u> . The three certification in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 Fed. Reg. 1412 (01.19.96.) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts has changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made.	
7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certification provided in this package if the assistance is awarded.	
8. Typed name of Chief Executive Officer <b>Governor Frank O'Bannon</b>	9. Telephone Number: <b>317/232-4567</b>
10. Signature of Chief Executive Officer <b>Frank O'Bannon</b>	11. Date <b>5/31/02</b>

OMB No. 1810-0576

Expires 11.30.2002

**ESEA PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN  
THE CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION**

**CHECKLIST**

The State of Indiana requests funds for the programs indicated below:

- ☒ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- ☒ Title I, Part B, Subpart 3: Even Start Family Literacy
- ☒ Title I, Part C: Education of Migrant Children
- ☒ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- ☒ Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform
- ☒ Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
- ☒ Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology
- ☒ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
- ☒ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1: Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
- ☒ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2: Community Service Grants
- ☒ Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers
- ☒ Title V, Part A: Innovative Programs
- ☒ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111: State Assessment Program
- ☒ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6112: Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program
- ☒ Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income Schools



### SEA Contacts for ESEA Programs

ESEA Program Title	SEA Program Contact		
	Name	Phone	E-Mail address
Title I, Part A	Marge Simic	317-232-0540	msimic@doe.state.in.us
Title I, Part B	Linda Warner	317-232-0521	lwarner@doe.state.in.us
Title I, Part C	Darlene Slaby	317-232-0551	dslaby@doe.state.in.us
Title I, Part D	Marge Simic	317-232-0540	msimic@doe.state.in.us
Title I, Part F	Marge Simic	317-232-0540	msimic@doe.state.in.us
Title II, Part A	Phyllis Land Usher	317-232-9101	pusher@doe.state.in.us
Title III, Part A	Darlene Slaby	317-232-0551	dslaby@doe.state.in.us
Title IV, Part A (SEA)	Jeff Barber	317-232-9143	jbarber@doe.state.in.us
Title IV, Part A (Governor)	Sally Shearer Fleck	317-232-7880	sfleck@fssa.state.in.us
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2	Jeff Barber	317-232-9143	jbarber@doe.state.in.us
Title IV, Part B	Vicky Schroeder	317-232-6984	vschroed@doe.state.in.us
Title V, Part A	Tracy Brown	317-232-6974	tbrown@doe.state.in.us
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6111	Wes Bruce	317-232-9050	wbruce@doe.state.in.us
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6112	Wes Bruce	317-232-9050	wbruce@doe.state.in.us
Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2	Tracy Brown	317-232-6974	tbrown@doe.state.in.us
Title II, Part D	Laura Taylor	317-232-9175	ltaylor@doe.state.in.us
Title II, Part A Subpart 3	Jeff Stanley	317-464-4400	Jeffs@che.state.in.us

## **Part I: ESEA Goals, ESEA Indicators, State Performance Targets**

The Indiana Department of Education has adopted the five ESEA performance goals and corresponding indicators specified under the U.S. Department of Education's consolidated state application requirements. These goals and indicators cut across the ESEA programs included in our application and reflect the goal of improving achievement for all students under the *No Child Left Behind* Act. Indiana agrees to submit by May 1, 2003 its performance targets and baseline data related to the following ESEA Goals and Indicators:

### **Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**

- 1.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)H1)(C)(i).)
- 1.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment.
- 1.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

### **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.
- 2.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.
- 2.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

### **Performance Goal 3: By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. (As the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101(34).)
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

### **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**

4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

**Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma,

- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;
- calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school,

- disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;
- calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

(Note: ESEA section 1907 requires States to report all LEA data regarding annual school dropout rates in the State disaggregated by race and ethnicity according to procedures that conform with the National Center for Educational Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data. Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," i.e., a student in Grades 9-12 who (a) was enrolled in the district at sometime during the previous school year; (b) was not enrolled at the beginning of the succeeding school year; (c) has not graduated or completed a program of studies by the maximum age established by the state; (d) has not transferred to another public school district or to a non-public school or to a State-approved educational program; and (e) has not left school because of death, illness, or school-approved absence.)

## Part II. State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs

### 1. Describe the State's system of standards, assessments, and accountability and provide evidence that it meets the requirements of the ESEA.

- a. Indiana has adopted challenging academic content standards in reading/language arts and mathematics at each grade level for Grades 3 through 8, consistent with section 1111(b)(1).
- b. Indiana has adopted challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).
- c. Indiana currently provides assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in reading/language arts and mathematics at Grades 3, 6, 8, and 10. The following timeline of major milestones governs the development and implementation, in consultation with LEAs, of assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required subjects and grade levels:

State Board of Education action	The Indiana State Board of Education has adopted an administrative rule, 511 IAC 6.2-6-2, which requires the Indiana Department of Education to develop and Indiana schools to administer the following tests: (1) Reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grades 3 through Grade 10. (2) Science tests at the three grade spans.
Determination of type of test	Under current Indiana statute and Indiana State Board of Education rule, each test will meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3). ISTEP+ tests are required to assess the state academic standards and have a mix of item formats.
Completion of test blueprint	Blueprints exist for Grades 3, 6, 8, and 10. The test blueprint was completed for Grades 4, 5, 7, and 9 as a part of the RFP process.
RFP published	The RFP has been published, proposals have been received, and contract negotiations are underway. The contract award is expected by the end of the fiscal year (June 30).

Completion of pilot test	<p>Pilot testing has occurred for the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) Reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grades 3, 6, 8, and 10.</li><li>(2) Science at the elementary level (Grade 5 for the 3 - 5 grade span).</li></ul> <p>Pilot testing will occur in 2003-2004 for Reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grades 4, 5, and 7.</p> <p>Pilot testing will occur in 2003-2004 for the science test at the middle level.</p> <p>Pilot testing will occur in 2005-2006 for the science test at the high school level.</p>
Completion of administrator's manual	<p>The test administrator's manual is updated and published annually during the spring before fall testing.</p>
Administration of assessment	<p>All reading/language arts and mathematics tests needed to meet NCLB in Grades 3 through 8 and Grade 10 will be administered in 2004-2005.</p> <p>All science tests needed at the three grade spans will be administered in 2006-2007.</p>
Completion of technical manual	<p>Each March a final technical manual is produced for the preceding year's test.</p>

- d. The following timeline of major milestones governs the setting, in consultation with LEAs, of academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1):

Availability of student test data	<p>Student data will be available in November 2002 for reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grades 3, 6, 8, and 10.</p> <p>Student data will be available in November 2004 for reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grades 4, 5, and 7.</p> <p>Student data will be available in November 2004 for reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grade 10 (new academic content standards).</p> <p>Student data will be available in November 2006 for science tests at the three grade spans.</p>
Achievement levels (labels)	Achievement levels will be adopted in August 2002.
Descriptions of those levels	Descriptions of the achievement levels will be adopted in December 2002.
Actual assessment scores for each achievement level (cut scores)	<p>Actual assessment scores for each achievement level will be adopted in January 2003 for reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grades 3, 6, and 8.</p> <p>Actual assessment scores for each achievement level will be adopted in December 2004 for reading/language arts and mathematics tests in Grades 4, 5, 7 and Grade 10 (new academic content standards).</p> <p>Actual assessment scores for each achievement level will be adopted in January 2007 for science tests at the three grade spans.</p>

- e. By January 31, 2003, Indiana will describe how the state calculated its ~~A~~starting point~~@~~as required for adequate yearly progress consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(E), including data elements and procedures for calculations.

- f. By January 31, 2003, Indiana will provide the state's definition of adequate yearly progress.
- g. By January 31, 2003, Indiana will identify the minimum number of students that the state has determined to be sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used and will justify this determination.
- h. Indiana's school accountability system will use the same criteria, based primarily on assessments consistent with section 1111(b), for determining whether a school has made adequate yearly progress, regardless of whether the school receives Title I, Part A, or other Federal funds.

Changes needed to achieve a single accountability system	None are needed. Indiana's accountability system under Indiana Code 20-10.2 and Indiana State Board of Education rules 511 IAC 6.2 applies to all schools.
Stakeholder involvement	The adoption of Indiana's legislation and rules involved regional town meetings, formal public hearings, and participation of advisory committees, including Indiana's Education Roundtable, a broad-based group of educators, business and community representatives, and legislators, co-chaired by the Governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction. These activities continue on a permanent basis.
Modification of state legislation and/or regulation	<p>There appears to be no need to modify state legislation. Although Indiana's accountability system was designed to measure improvement of individual students from one year to the next, the data system provides information necessary to determine if a school has made adequate yearly progress as defined in section 1111.</p> <p>The Indiana State Board of Education has initiated amendments to its rules to ensure that limited English proficient students are included in the assessment system as required by section 1111.</p>

Rewards and sanctions	<p>Indiana's accountability system includes awards for increases in achievement, as measured by the state test.</p> <p>Indiana's accountability system includes sanctions similar or identical to those in section 1116 for schools that do not improve.</p>
Accountability based primarily on assessments	Results of the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) are declared by law to be the primary method of measuring improvement.
State intends to apply AYP to every public school	By law, Indiana's accountability system applies to every public school. By submitting this application the state declares that it intends to apply AYP to every public school.
Resources and capacity	<p>Indiana's school funding formula provides additional funds to LEAs based on an at-risk index.</p> <p>Indiana also provides remediation funds to LEAs based on the number of students who do not pass ISTEP+ or are at-risk of not passing. LEAs with the highest percentage of students who do not pass receive the largest per pupil distribution.</p> <p>The Indiana Department of Education provides technical assistance and resources to low performing schools.</p>
Single accountability system in place by May 2003	If modifications are necessary, they will be made by May 2003.

- i. Language minority students enrolled in Indiana public schools for school year 2000-01 represented 212 native languages other than English. The top five languages represented were Spanish, German (Amish), Korean, Mandarin Chinese, and Arabic (Language Minority Enrollment Summary SY 2000-01, see <<http://ideanet.doe.state.in.us/lmmp/language.html>>). Because instruction in Indiana schools is provided in English, assessment will also be conducted in English. LEP students participating in Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP+), the statewide academic assessment, will receive approved testing accommodations now under review by the State Board of Education. Currently approved accommodations include:



- C more time;
  - C small group administration; and
  - C administration by a familiar teacher.
- j. The SEA will provide an annual assessment of English proficiency for all language minority students statewide in the areas of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension. The SEA has consistently recommended annual English proficiency assessment for LEP students as part of the language minority student identification process and currently recommends three assessment instruments including Language Assessment Scales (LAS), Woodcock-Muñoz, and Idea Proficiency Test (IPT). To ensure uniformity and accountability, the SEA will select and implement a single English proficiency assessment instrument for use statewide during school year 2002-03. LEAs will be made aware of which test has been chosen via the statewide email listserv, Superintendent's mailing, SEA website, and through various technical assistance opportunities.
- k. The SEA is in the process of developing standards and annual measurable achievement objectives related to the development of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension aligned with state standards through:
  - C The Indiana ESL Taskforce, a formal group established to represent LEAs serving LEP students statewide, which has utilized its bi-monthly meetings to assist in the development of standards and annual measurable achievement objectives. The ESL Taskforce consists of LEA program coordinators, administrators, and SEA staff.
  - C Title III Informational Workshops conducted by the SEA in May 2002 throughout the state to provide technical assistance to LEAs and gain feedback and suggestions from LEAs on establishment of standards and achievement objectives.
  - C Collaboration with SEA staff, SEAs in other states, CCSSO, and U.S. Department of Education staff.

The SEA will submit the standards and annual measurable achievement objectives in May 2003.

**2. Describe key procedures, selection criteria, and priorities the State will use to award competitive subgrants (or contracts) to the entities and for the activities required by the program statutes of applicable programs included in the consolidated application.**

**a. Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B)**

INDIANA EVEN START GRANT TIMELINE

Program Year 2002-2003

December 14, 2001	Availability of competitive Even Start federal funding and announcement of Bidders' Conference sent
February 1, 2002	Bidders' Conference held
April 12, 2002	Even Start competitive proposals due

April 17, 2002	Continuation applications sent to existing program
April 25-26, 2002	Review panel meets to rate proposals
May 20, 2002	Notification letters of review panel results sent to applicants
May 30, 2002	Continuation proposals due
June 2002	On-site visits and negotiations held with prospective new grant awardees
June 17, 2002	Notification of continuation grant awards for program year 2002-2003
June 30, 2002	Notification of new grant awards

### New Grant Process

The state initiates the RFP process for new grants with an announcement of the availability of funds and a bidders' conference, which applicants are required to attend. At the bidders' conference the program and application requirements are reviewed, the RFP is distributed, and questions are addressed. Prospective applicants must submit an "intent to apply" form followed by the application.

Each proposal is reviewed by a panel consisting of (a) an early childhood education professional; (b) an adult education professional; and (c) at least one additional member who is either a representative of a parent-child educational organization, a representative of a community-based literacy organization, a member of a local board of education, a representative of business and industry with a commitment to education, or an individual who has been involved in the implementation of the state's Title I program. The review panels rate proposal content within the areas described in 2.c.

Only proposals that receive 200 or more of the possible 250 points (at least 80 percent of the possible points) from the review panel will be eligible for further consideration. Proposals are considered in rank order, starting with the highest rated proposal. The SEA also takes into account the balance of urban and rural programs in the approval process. The criteria listed in 2.c. and the amount of available funding determine which projects proceed to the next step, the on-site review.

The state coordinator conducts on-site reviews with the applicants having the highest rated proposals that fall within the level of available funding to further determine whether projects have reasonable expectation of being implemented as written. Concerns raised during the review process are addressed during the on-site visit.

Applicants receive a written summary of the on-site review that includes findings, outstanding issues, required follow-up needed, and recommendations for funding. As a condition of funding, the SEA may require program and budget modifications.

### Continuation Grant Process

Current grantees requesting continuation funding are required to submit a narrative proposal that addresses the past year's program performance and any proposed modifications in the program related to targeted populations, site locations, co-applicants,

personnel, program design, and resource allocation. An itemized budget that includes the federal Even Start funding request and the local match commitment accompanies the narrative.

The state coordinator reviews the continuation application along with the mid-year and end-of-year performance reports to determine if sufficient progress is being made toward meeting project objectives and performance indicators to warrant continued funding. After four years of Even Start funding, programs must re-compete for another four-year funding cycle.

#### Selection Criteria for New Competitive Grants

Competitive applications for new programs will be judged on the criteria listed below. Details to be addressed in each of the following sections are designed to determine whether the applicant has met the statutory program purposes and requirements, as well as the state's priorities. (See attached Panel Review Rating Instrument.)

Proposal planning process: The proposal provides evidence of active local involvement in the development of the project and that the project fits into the overall scheme of services in the school and community. (Maximum points: 20)

Need for project: The proposal demonstrates that the area to be served has a high percentage or a large number of families eligible for Even Start programs and in need of those services where such needs cannot be otherwise fully addressed by existing providers. The project's targeted population is defined as families most-in-need of services or those who are located in designated empowerment zones and enterprise communities. (Maximum points: 30)

Project Design and Services: The proposed project is designed to target, recruit, and facilitate participation and retention of the eligible population. The project design will provide sufficient intensity and duration of instruction and needed support services to meet program performance indicators for program participation and academic achievement. Start-up funds are available for use prior to the beginning of actual instruction (up to six months in the first year of funding). (Maximum points: 40)

Family-Focused Education Services: The proposed project includes high quality adult education, early childhood education, parenting support, and literacy-based parent-and-child together activities in cohesive education services designed to meet the parent support/training performance indicator. (Maximum points: 40)

Administrative and Staffing Plan: The proposal reflects the administrative and staff support necessary for the project's successful development, administration, and implementation, evidenced by job descriptions and resumes of proposed staff. Indiana's minimum educational and certification requirements for project staff meet or exceed the federal statutory requirements. Professional development opportunities available to all staff are specified. (Maximum points: 20)

Collaboration and Coordination: There is evidence that coordination and collaboration in all phases of the project will build upon and not duplicate services provided to participants by other agencies. (Maximum points: 30)

Evaluation and Likelihood of Success: The proposed project establishes learner outcomes in (1) early childhood education, (2) adult education, and (3) parenting involvement that meet or exceed the state's performance indicators. The project's planned internal and external evaluation strategies will be used to ensure a rigorous and objective evaluation of progress toward the meeting the program's objectives and the state's performance indicators. There is evidence that the applicant and/or co-applicant have had recent success in operating at least one of the Even Start program components. The project shows promise of success as a demonstration project, which might be transferable and used by others. (Maximum points: 25)

Budget and Collaborative Support: The budget for the proposed project appears reasonable and appropriate and demonstrates collaborative support from the applying partnership in the community. The in-kind/cash contributions demonstrate that the applying partners are contributing to the project and are making reasonable and effective use of other community resources. (Maximum points: 35)

#### State Priorities

In the awarding of subgrants, the SEA gives priority to applications that target services to families located in an area that has a high percentage or a large number of children and families who are in need of Even Start services or who are located in designated empowerment zones or enterprise communities. The state's application requirements and selection criteria are designed to reflect the statutory requirements and foster projects that are likely to result in student achievement outcomes.

### **b. Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)**

Local school districts that anticipate submitting an application for a funded migrant project attend an annual spring Migrant Education Project Directors' Workshop. This is an opportunity to gather the most current information, receive updates on effective practices, and obtain the grant application. School districts that have a concentration of eligible migrant students then submit a comprehensive plan that describes all aspects of service delivery. Each prospective project conducts a needs assessment that includes instructional and support needs. There must be a plan to access services through all existing resources in order to make certain that the Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP) is supplemental. Verification of migrant eligibility is done through the comprehensive state identification and recruitment program that makes certain that each student will have a Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Local projects focus on providing continuity of instruction while working with secondary students for credit accrual. There is a strong emphasis on language development with increased performance in reading and mathematics. Priority is always given to migrant students who are failing, or at greatest risk of failing to meet State academic standards. Additionally, students whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year are a priority. Consideration is given

to the sufficient size, scope and quality of each project. The plans are carefully reviewed by SEA staff to make certain that eligible migrant students will receive supplemental services that meet their needs. The process does not stop with the plan or application. Implementation is closely monitored to ensure student success.

A timeline for the process of awarding migrant subgrants has been developed and follows an annual pattern. Grant applications are made available at the annual spring Project Directors' Workshop. In Indiana, there are migrant projects that operate during the summer, fall and regular full school year. Summer applications are due May 1<sup>st</sup>, and fall and regular school year applications are due June 28<sup>th</sup>. Applications are processed within two weeks of the due date. Adjustments are made to program content and budgets as needed. Site visitations are conducted by SEA staff to each subgrantee and summary reports with positive feedback and recommendations are sent after each visit. Summer projects are visited once during the project period; fall and regular school year projects are visited twice during the project period. Two weeks after each project period ends, the subgrantee completes an End of the Project Performance Report. This report serves as a project evaluation.

**c. Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk—Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)**

The SEA allocates grants to eligible LEAs under Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 as a formula grant. Locally operated Neglected and /or Delinquent programs receive funds based upon the per pupil amount received by the school district in which the locally operated correctional facility or community day program is located. The per pupil amount is multiplied by the number of children that resided in the institution for 30 consecutive days, at least one of which was in October, during the preceding year. The product of this calculation is the amount of funds awarded to the school district to operate instructional programs for the neglected or delinquent students. Applications are made available to school districts annually by May, then districts annually apply for these funds that provide services to local delinquent institutions. Funds are available by August. The statute does not require selection criteria or priorities for this program.

**State Agency Operated Programs:**

Funds distributed to state agencies are based upon the formula described in Section 1412 of the reauthorized ESEA. A state agency is eligible for assistance if it is responsible for providing free public education for children and youth--

- In institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth;
- Attending community day programs for neglected or delinquent children and youth; or
- In adult correctional institutions.

The state agency is eligible for a subgrant in an amount equal to the product of:

- The number of neglected or delinquent children and youth it serves who

- Are enrolled for at least 15 hours per week in education programs in adult correctional institutions;
- Are enrolled for at least 20 hours per week:
  - In education programs in institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth; or
  - In community day programs for neglected or delinquent children and youth.
- Forty percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in the State, except that the amount determined shall not be less than 32 percent or more than 48 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in the United States.

Through the Statewide system of support, State Agency facilities and delinquent institutions may participate in technical assistance for institution-wide improvement:

Intensive Support for State and Neglected/Delinquent Institution(s)—This school support system includes components designed specifically for juvenile detention centers under the Indiana Department of Correction and neglected/delinquent institutions within the LEA boundaries. This *planning and implementation partnership* with Dynamic Transitions, the Division of Special Education, and Title I demonstrates the potential of *creating model institution-wide sites* that exercise the flexibility of combining federal dollars from Title I and IDEA to carry out institution-wide projects that improve the teaching and learning of all disadvantaged students residing in neglected, delinquent, and state agency institutions. The outcomes of this partnership will be used to expand the support to other juvenile centers in this state institution and Indiana's other state institution for neglected children.

Components of this process provide: 1) a comprehensive needs assessment of the educational needs of all youth in the institution; 2) a description of the process taken to design the school plan (the infrastructure for interactive participation and team-building); 3) goals and strategies for meeting the needs of students; 4) a professional development plan that supports teachers' ongoing professional learning; 5) a description of the instructional program used to meet the needs of all students; and 6) an assessment plan that describes how student progress will be regularly and consistently measured and how the plan will be monitored for implementation. Technical assistance will align the school's plan with standards and accountability as required under Indiana's PL 221.

Consultants make regular on-site technical assistance visits; provide team-building opportunities for the development of a coherent planning team; provide a comprehensive assessment of the institution; initiate a committee structure based on the findings of the study; establish a decision-making model based on consensus; develop a vision statement to guide the process; provide the committees with the latest research related to the education of juvenile populations; coordinate the professional development activities for the entire staff that enable teachers and personnel to carry out the institution-wide plan effectively; provide leadership support; and assist the correctional school in implementing and monitoring the progress of the institution-wide plan.

**d. Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)****Comprehensive School Reform Subgrant Process, Selection Criteria and Strategies**

The SEA will use a multiple step process that includes expert review to make competitive grants to eligible local districts (LEAs). This process targets resources toward schools with greatest need for reform and will ensure that only high-quality and well-defined comprehensive school reform programs that meet all nine CSRD criteria are funded. As part of the application, each Indiana CSRD program must document the theory and/or research base that anchors its design and provides effectiveness evidence of the design's key elements.

***Targeting Resources Toward Schools with the Greatest Need for Reform***

As an initial step, two data sources will be used to weight each school's CSRD proposal: (1) its need to improve student achievement and (2) its level of poverty. The determination of the need to improve student achievement will utilize the previous two years' ISTEP+ results, specifically the percentage of students who met the performance standards for English/language arts and mathematics. As summarized on the following table, a maximum of fifty (50) points will be assigned on a sliding scale, with schools having less than thirty-five percent (35%) of their students passing ISTEP+ receiving the most points while those with seventy-five (75%) or more of their students meeting State criteria receiving zero points. This procedure will highlight those schools that are identified for Title school improvement [as specified in section 1116(c) of Title I].

<b><i>Need to Improve Student Achievement Sliding Scale</i></b>			
<i>Percentage of Students Passing ISTEP+ English/Language Arts</i>		<i>Percentage of Students Passing ISTEP+ Mathematics</i>	
<b>Previous Year</b>	<b>Current Year</b>	<b>Previous Year</b>	<b>Current Year</b>
<35% .....10 points	<35% .....15 points	<35% .....10 points	<35% .....15 points
35% -50% .....8 points	35% -50% .....10 points	35% -50% .....8 points	35% -50% .....10 points
51% -74% .....5 points	51% -74% .....5 points	51% -74% .....5 points	51% -74% .....5 points
75% .....0 points	75% .....0 points	75% .....0 points	75% .....0 points

Free and reduced lunch percentages will identify poverty schools. A sliding scale, similar to that used to target schools in need of academic improvement, will assign a maximum of thirty (30) points based on the previous two years' data. For consistency in determining this percentage, the free and reduced lunch counts for the month of October will be used. Each district is required to submit this information to the State and the data can be collected from the Division of Educational Information Services. Schools with seventy-five (75%) or greater poverty will receive the most points, while those with less than thirty-five (35%) will receive 0 points.

<i>Scale for Level of Poverty</i>	
<i>Previous Year's Percentage of Free &amp; Reduced Lunch</i>	<i>Current Year's Percentage of Free &amp; Reduced Lunch</i>
75% .....15 points	75% .....15 points
50% -74% .....10 points	50% -74% .....10 points
35% -49% .....5 points	35% -49% .....5 points
< 35% .....0 points	< 35% .....0 points

The SEA will encourage CSRD proposals from schools at all grade levels and in different parts of the state. To provide an incentive for schools at all grade levels to submit CSRD proposals, up to five points will be awarded for strong transition plans with schools in the same feeder pattern. These points will be awarded for clear strategies that address instructional continuity as well as support for student transition. These five points are considered sufficient to boost each school's score, and, potentially increase the possibility of CSRD awards for all schools applying from the same feeder system. However, the weighting is limited to five points so as not to override the emphasis on overall proposal quality. Likewise, to promote the selection of schools in different parts of the state, proposals scoring a minimum of ninety (90) out of the one hundred thirty-five (135) "quality of CSRD plan" points, will be listed in rank order according to six (6) geographic regions within the State. When high-ranking proposals are within the same pre-determined range of total points (academic need + poverty + proposal quality), awards will be made to ensure a broad geographic distribution of CSRD schools whose proposals meet high standards.

#### *Supporting Effective, Research-based Comprehensive School Reform Programs*

Only high-quality, well-defined, and well-documented comprehensive school reform programs that integrate, in a cohesive manner, all nine (9) of the required CSRD components will be funded in Indiana. The three stages in the sub-grant process are designed to ensure that this priority is met.

### **Stage 1: Preliminary CSRD Proposal Application**

#### **A. Submission of a Preliminary Application**

Indiana experience has shown that schools must have some experience in planning and implementing school reform before they can successfully handle the challenges of comprehensive reform. As such, at stage one, Indiana schools will be required to submit a preliminary CSRD application to document their experience in planning and implementing school reform. This preliminary proposal includes:

1. a copy of the school's current school improvement plan, including a needs assessment summary, the goals and strategies for reform, the professional development plan, and the assessment plan.
2. a copy of the school's most recent school-wide performance assessment;
3. a one-page description of how staff were involved in planning and implementing school reform;
4. a cover letter from the superintendent demonstrating the district's support of this Title I school in implementing a CSRD plan over a three year period.



**B. Review of the Preliminary Application**

These preliminary applications will be reviewed by the SEA staff using a three rank rating scale that examines the school's current reform plan and documented experience with performance assessment and staff involvement in planning and implementing reform. A total of 80 points is possible on the rating instrument. Schools meriting 40 or more points are invited to go on to stage two of the CSRD process. Schools that do not attain the cut score will be offered feedback on their preliminary proposal submission to help them reconsider their reform efforts.

**Stage 2: Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Proposal**

Schools that demonstrated the required level of reform experience are invited to submit a CSRD proposal that addresses the nine required components of the law. Once the completed proposals are received by the SEA, the following steps ensure that each proposal is well-considered before approval.

**A. Framework for Indiana CSRD Programs**

In order to ensure that each funded program is comprehensive and cohesive whole rather than a collection of fragments, the SEA has outlined a four-part CSRD design framework that encompasses the nine legal requirements. (*See Appendix B.*) The four elements and required components addressed by each are:

- Comprehensive design for increasing student achievement, addresses required components one (*effective, research-based methods and strategies*) and two (*comprehensive design with aligned components*);
- Support for teaching, learning and implementation, addresses required components three (*professional development*) and seven (*external technical support and assistance*);
- On-going accountability, addresses required components four (*measurable goals and benchmarks*) and eight (*evaluation strategies*); and
- Internal and external support for CSRD change, addresses required components five (*support within the school*), six (*parental and community involvement*) and nine (*coordination of resources*).

This CSRD Design Framework has been disseminated throughout the state and is part of each CSRD proposal packet. The integration of the components into a quality CSRD program is more important than any model or single component of that design. The SEA emphasizes that whether the CSRD program is an externally developed or locally developed research-based model, it must be well matched to the school's identified needs and integrate the required components into a coherent design.

**CSRD Integrated Framework****I. Design a Comprehensive Program for Increasing Student Achievement**

- a. Ground the CSR program in a comprehensive needs assessment
  - Address the identified priority needs in the CSR program
- b. Identify the research/theory base of the CSR design

- Identify the research-based principles that undergird the design
  - Cite references from current research/theory and/or provide evidence of program's/strategies' impact on student achievement
  - c. Include components that align key strategies and instruction practice/approaches
    - Consider reading, writing, and math and/or interdisciplinary (must have 3 goals related to Indiana Academic Standards)
    - Align strategies with Indiana Academic Standards (curriculum-instruction-assessment alignment)
    - Utilize technology (as appropriate)
  - d. Address classroom environment and school management strategies needed to support the instructional program.
  - e. include all grade levels and all classrooms in the school's CSR program
  - f. Provide a range of support services to ensure that all students learn
- [I. Addresses required components 1 (effective, research-based methods and strategies) and 2 (comprehensive design with aligned components)]
- II. Provide Support for Teaching/Learning and Implementation of the Design
- a. Provide on-going professional development
    - Schedule adequate time through job-embedded professional development and options outside regular school day/year
    - Find time through a restructured school day/week/year, as necessary
  - b. Provide whole staff professional development on priority focus/foci
    - Ensure adequate breadth and depth to support high quality implementation
    - Include additional and appropriate training options needed for individual and small groups
  - c. Provide regularly scheduled, on-going collaboration
    - Collaborate for planning and problem-solving to support high quality instruction
    - Include all grade-levels, all teachers, all instructional assistants
  - d. Include strategy/ies to support transfer to classroom practice (e.g., in-house facilitator, coaching models, instructional lead teacher/team leader, action research)
  - e. Involve external technical assistance and support
    - Involve external technical assistance in assessment checkpoints and for implementation support as needed
    - Utilize an external technical assistance provider with the following characteristics: 1) a well informed understanding of school change; 2) knowledgeable about the school's CSR design, e.g., research-based practices, standards-based education, strategies to support curriculum-instruction-assessment alignment based on Indiana Academic Standards and ISTEP+; 3) adequate expertise in facilitating the organization and analysis of CSR assessment and supportive in identifying needed

refinements; and 4) a supportive “critical friend” who shares feedback with the school staff

[Addresses required components 3 (professional development) and 7 (external technical support and assistance)].

### III. Evaluate and Refine the Design Through On-going Accountability

- a. Evaluate the impact on student learning
  - Set measurable goals for student performance on ISTEP+ *Proficiency Performance Summary*: 1) set benchmarks for meeting those goals; and 2) do subgroup analysis to monitor performance of all students.
  - Gather performance assessment results related to Indiana Academic Standards for all grade level.
  - Gather and review data from the *Annual Performance Report* (the “School Report Card”)
- b. Assess implementation to identify refinements and needed support
  - For each goal (minimum of 3), assess the consistency and quality of implementation within: 1) key strategies; 2) professional development; 3) family and community involvement; and 4) technology (where appropriate)
  - Monitor progress on the school’s CSR design using the school’s implementation profile (one for each goal) from the CSR proposal
  - Check for the transfer of professional development to classroom practice
- c. Include a schedule of checkpoints when summarized data will be reviewed by all staff
- d. Use of technology to make assessment procedures efficient

[Addresses required component 4 (measurable goals and benchmarks) and 8 (evaluation strategies)]

### IV. Provide Internal and External Support for the CSR Design

- a. Emphasize school leadership
  - Principal leadership: specify activities that support CSR implementation on a daily, weekly, and/or monthly basis
  - Staff leadership: use participatory decision-making approaches emphasizing communication and problem-solving
- b. Provide structural and logistical support to the school (examples include schedule changes, contract waivers with the teachers’ union, and changes in “traditional” school routines)
- c. Support staff, family and community ownership of CSR program
  - Use a planning process that builds consensus for the CSR design
  - Use participatory decision-making strategies to support problem-solving and implementation

- d. Nurture strong family and community involvement through clear communication and activities that promote
  - “parents in the school” involvement, including parent education and training
  - “parents at home” involvement (parental support for learning at home)
  - active involvement of business and community in the school
- e. Demonstrate district support for the school’s CSR program
  - Align school CSR program with district vision/mission and/or strategic plan
  - Identify a central office liaison for the school’s CSR program
  - Ensure central office support for CSR activities, e.g., facilitate paperwork, help remove barriers
- f. Describe the transition strategies to ensure continuity with feeder and receiving schools
  - Identify major curricular and instructional expectations that clarify what students are expected to know and be able to do at each level when schooling transitions (elementary-to-middle school; middle school-to-high school)
  - Describe any other efforts that support successful student transition among schools
- g. Utilize all available funding sources to pay for CSR components; plan for sustainability
  - Project major budget expenses for Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3; then demonstrate sustainability in Year 4 when CSR funds are no longer available

[Addresses required component 5 (support within the school), 6 (parental and community involvement) and 9 (coordination of resources)]

The SEA has purposely set the standards for schools with its CSRD Design Framework. However, the preliminary application stage ensures that schools entering CSRD have an adequate foundation for comprehensive school reform. A number of Indiana schools have this foundation based on previous support for their change efforts through the Title I School Support System. The SEA provides a year-long structured process for developing a research-based school reform plan and up to two years of additional support as a school initially implements its improvement plan. The SEA encourages schools that have undergone this extensive school reform planning and implementation process to consider submitting a Reading First or CSRD proposal. Experience and data from CSRD schools in the first four years of CSRD indicates that these schools are at the readiness stage for comprehensive school reform and become credible demonstration sites for future CSRD aspirants.

**B. Initial review of CSRD proposals:**

The schools that attained 40 or more points at the preliminary application stage are invited to submit a full CSRD proposal. Once received at the SEA, each CSRD proposal will receive an initial review to ensure that all nine components as well as

the required assurances and signatures have been included. Incomplete proposals will not be reviewed by the panel of experts and will not be considered for funding.

C. Panel review process for CSRD proposals:

A three-member panel from representative backgrounds will review and rate each CSRD proposal that was complete according to the initial review step. Panel members will be selected from LEAs, professional organizations, community and social agencies, and university staff. Their backgrounds and expertise in curriculum, school reform and change processes, school leadership, and/or family-community involvement will directly relate to comprehensive school reform. All panel members will receive training before beginning to review proposals. To the extent possible, experienced reviewers who have previously demonstrated a knowledgeable and fair approach to proposal review will be used in the review process.

The panel review will be a one-day, on-site process. Prior to the training, panel members will receive a packet of background materials, such as the CSRD law and pertinent professional publications. During the on-site process, each reviewer reads and rates each assigned proposal individually and then meets with other panel members to reach consensus on each proposal's rating. When there are a limited number of proposals to review and experienced reviewers available, the panel review will begin with individual reading and rating of proposals off-site, followed by a one-day panel meeting supervised by the SEA.

Regardless of whether the initial reading of proposals occurs on- or off-site, there will be an embedded (common) proposal in all reviewers' first set of proposals to check for inter-rater reliability. Re-training will be provided in any area(s) where there is a less-than-acceptable inter-rater range. Inter-rater reliability will also be re-checked at the end of the review process to ensure that adequate consistency was maintained.

D. Rating the quality of a CSRD proposal:

The CSRD application and rating criteria are built on the previously described framework. A maximum of 140 points may be awarded a CSRD proposal for its quality, coherency and promise for successful implementation. Each of the elements has been assigned points, and then within that element, the points are distributed across supporting components. The point assignment is summarized on the following chart.

Point Assignment for CSRD Application Review	
Implementation profile – A “road map” to support progress toward whole school reform ( <i>10 points</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> clear linkage between the listed next steps and activities for progress in each goal ( <i>5 points</i> )
	<input type="checkbox"/> the next steps are specific & rigorous enough to help move the school forward in its reform efforts and meeting its goals & benchmarks ( <i>5 points</i> )

<b>Point Assignment for CSRD Application Review</b>	
A comprehensive design for increasing student achievement ( <i>40 points</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> comprehensive design with aligned components that includes all grades/classrooms in the school ( <i>20 points</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> effective, research-based methods and strategies related to student learning, teaching and school management ( <i>20 points</i> )
Support for teaching, learning and implementation ( <i>25 points</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> on-going professional development focused on implementing the comprehensive design ( <i>20 points</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> high quality external technical assistance ( <i>5 points</i> )
On-going accountability ( <i>25 points</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> measurable goals and benchmarks for evaluating impact on student learning ( <i>10 points</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> evaluation strategies addressing implementation progress ( <i>10 points</i> )
Internal and external support for CSRD change ( <i>20 points</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> supportive school environment, including leadership support and site-based decision-making ( <i>5 points</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> a variety of options for parent and community involvement in both planning and implementing the CSRD design ( <i>5 points</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> supportive LEA environment, including specific ways the district will remove barriers and facilitate the CSRD implementation ( <i>5 points</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> transition plan with feeder and receiving schools ( <i>5 points</i> )
Budget ( <i>10 points</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> detailed budget for Year 1 <input type="checkbox"/> projected budget that addresses long-term sustainability and coordination and/or reallocation of multiple funding sources
Bibliography ( <i>5 points</i> )	<input type="checkbox"/> reflects a body of knowledge from respected, juried professional journals & books by well-known researchers about effective instruction that provides a theoretical, as well as practical, foundation for learning (articles & books include evidence of impact, not just descriptions) <input type="checkbox"/> multiple sources for each goal are used to guide the effective design of the reform plan

\* The final 5 points of the 140 total points is awarded if a proposal has a strong transition plan with feeder and receiving schools.

All proposals begin with the panel review process on an equal footing. The panel of experts will be provided a rubric and continuum of evidence to guide their review and the awarding of points for the CSRD proposals. A draft of that rubric was included with the original plan. However, the actual points awarded will reflect each reviewer's perceptions of quality and readiness for CSRD based on the program outlined in a proposal.

E. Summary of panel ratings:

Each panel will determine the sequence in which members read, review and assign the ratings to the team's proposals; then each member independently will review the proposals in that sequence. During the review process, panel members will hold group meetings each half-day to share their individual numeric ratings. When panel member ratings are within a specified range (i.e., within 25% of a section's possible points), the panel will compute an arithmetic average for the proposal(s). If discrepancies are larger than 25% of a section's possible points, then the panel will discuss the differing scores from their various perspectives. These discussions are not intended to force numeric agreement among panel members; however, a panel member may choose to adjust the points assigned based on additional information from his/her colleagues.

A *Panel Review Summary Form* will be completed for each assigned proposal, listing each reviewer's ratings and the overall average from the panel. Only proposals that receive average scores of 90 or more of the 125 possible points, based on the results from the *Panel Review Summary Forms*, will be considered for funding.

For those proposals with 90 or more points, a total will be computed by adding the panel review average, the points based on the need to improve student achievement, and the points based on the school's poverty. Based on the total scores, schools will be sorted into four levels:

- Level 1: 175-205 points
- Level 2: 150-174 points
- Level 3: 125-149 points
- Level 4: 90-124 points

Potential CSRD schools will then be sorted in the six geographic regions within the state according to Levels 1, 2, 3, or 4.

### **Stage 3: On-site review of the highest rated proposals**

Beginning with the Level 1 schools, an on-site review will be conducted for each potential CSRD school to validate:

- the paper claims of the proposal;
- the school's readiness for comprehensive school reform, *e.g., individual staff member's knowledge and support for the plan, the school's process for involving staff and parents in planning and decision-making;*
- its capacity to implement the CSRD program as designed, *e.g., coordination and reallocation of available resources, existing programs and reform efforts related to the CSRD design;* and
- the LEA's involvement and commitment to each CSRD school.

These reviews are scheduled within four-to-six weeks of the proposal review. On-site review teams are composed of educators with extensive experience with school reform. A two-member team is involved in each local visit, and on each on-site review is

scheduled for at least one-half day per school. The on-site team gives the final assessment of a school's potential for success in implementing its CSRSD program.

Because schools in Levels 1 and 2 will be funded before schools at lower levels, the number of SEA on-site reviews will not exceed the maximum number of schools that can be supported with CSRSD funds. If the number of schools in the four levels exceeds the SEA's capacity to fund, Level 4 schools would be eliminated from on-site review consideration. This elimination process would proceed to Level 3, and so on until the number of schools considered for on-site review is within the SEA's capacity to fund. After the on-site reviews of higher ranked levels, if a number of potential CSRSD schools are determined to lack readiness for comprehensive reform, the SEA may, at its discretion, conduct additional on-site reviews at the remaining levels.

### **Final approval of CSRSD awards**

With on-site team's confirmation of a school's readiness and potential for success, the SEA will provide the LEA with official notification of the grant award by May 30. Funds become available to schools receiving CSRSD grants on July 1 of the fiscal year.

### **Technical Assistance for CSRSD Schools**

Because of the high expectations in Indiana's CSRSD Design Framework and the required reform experience prior to applying for CSRSD, schools need time and support to develop their readiness for comprehensive reform. The SEA provides these through its Title I School Support System. The major steps in this approach include:

- gathering and analyzing data as part of a comprehensive needs assessment;
- using a variety of inquiry strategies to explore research-based practices to address priority needs;
- utilizing consensus building strategies to develop CSRSD goals;
- developing and refining a comprehensive design to meet those goals; and
- developing benchmarks and assessment strategies for the CSRSD program.

Schools in need of improvement because of low student achievement may voluntarily enter this support system each year. The SEA offers overview meetings each spring to acquaint interested schools with the support being offered, and the SEA-provided technical assistance begins each summer before the start of the school year. During the reform planning year, participating schools are involved in four group workshops and five all-day on-site visits from consultants experienced in leading schools through the reform planning process. As part of each group workshop and on-site visit, each school identifies specific action steps that will be taken to engage their entire staff in this consensus-focused process leading to the school's research-based school improvement plan.

Once its improvement plan is developed, a school may elect to continue participation in the SEA's School Support System for an additional two year's of implementation support. During the implementation phase, a school's steering committee participates in up to three group workshops and three on-site visits from consultants each year. Support during these years centers in initial implementation and evaluation of the school's reform



effort. Assessment using staff implementation and student impact data is emphasized, and the steering committee is facilitated through a review and refinement of the school's reform plan, leading to an updated action plan for the next school year.

The process is well-aligned with the state's new school reform law which requires the development of school improvement plans using a recognized and structured planning process and on-going review and refinement of each plan. The Title I School Support System is a well-respected approach for meeting this requirement.

As schools progress in their reform efforts they may choose to expand their basic school reform plan into a CSRD or Reading First proposal. Each year a CSRD/Reading First informational meeting will be held in early fall to outline the requirements and expectations of reading reform and comprehensive school reform grants in Indiana. Based on their self-assessed readiness, a school may elect to submit a preliminary CSRD or Reading First Application to the SEA by mid-November.

Schools that are successful based on previously described Preliminary CSRD Application review process will be invited to submit a full CSRD. These schools will be encouraged to attend a CSRD proposal information session. At this one-day meeting, they will be guided through reflections about their school's vision for reform and how to explicitly communicate that vision in terms of the specific requirements of CSRD.

Schools that are successful with their proposal and receive a CSRD grant also receive follow-up technical assistance after funding:

1. June: two-day evaluation training session (*information about the evaluation plan and reporting requirements*)
2. September: a follow-up evaluation session (*sharing of statewide CSRD evaluation data and networking among CSRD schools*)
3. November: quarterly review of performance and implementation assessment; complete first quarter summative assessment of strategies;
4. February: statewide meeting and sharing session with all funded CSRD schools (*monitor implementation*); quarterly review of performance and implementation assessment; complete second quarter summative assessment of strategies;
5. May: statewide meeting and sharing session with all funded CSRD schools (*monitor implementation*); quarterly review of performance and implementation assessment; complete third/fourth quarter summative assessment of strategies;
6. CSRD schools also have networking opportunities in conjunction with Title I regional networking meetings. (*Title I regional meetings occur a minimum of three times each year in each region, offering multiple possibilities for such networking.*)

During their three years of CSRD, schools will receive additional technical assistance from the SEA. During its first CSRD year, each school will participate in three hands-on workshops using data from performance assessment of its students and implementation assessment with its staff. Three sessions focus on achieving a high quality assessment

process, *e.g., inter-rater reliability, efficient data summary, analysis procedures, and using assessment data to drive instructional and reform decisions.*

During the second CSRD year, schools participate in sessions aimed at ensuring an effective process for supporting transfer of professional development to classroom practice and efficiently coordinating and managing the reform process. In the third year of CSRD, schools will participate in sessions aimed at aligning an effective family involvement plan to the state's standards and reform strategies. See the time line for school year 2002-2003.

DATE	CSR Evaluation Activities (2002-2003)
September 4, 2002 (9:00 – 3:30)	CSR Technical Assistance: Review 2001-2002 Evaluation Revise Profiles; Assessment Matrix; Summative Assessment of Strategies to align w/ feedback from evaluation
September 5, 2002 (9:00 – 12:30)	
September 30, 2002	Complete CSR Final Expenditure Report for 2001-2002 funds
October 15 - 30, 2002	Submit to Division of Compensatory Education (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2001-2002 CSR Final Expenditure Report</li> <li>• Revised 2002-2003 CSR Budget (includes carryover amount from the previous year's total CSR funds)</li> <li>• Revised 2002-2003 CSR Cash Request page</li> </ul>
November 14, 2002 (9:00 – 3:30)	CSR Technical Assistance: Summative Assessment Review #1
November 15, 2002 (9:00 – 12:30)	
February 25, 2003 (9:00 – 3:30)	CSR Technical Assistance: Summative Assessment Review #2
February 26, 2003 (9:00 – 12:30)	
May 15, 2003 (9:00 – 3:30)	CSR Technical Assistance: Summative Assessment Review #3 & #4
May 16, 2003 (9:00 – 12:30)	
July 1, 2003	Submit to Division of Compensatory Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summative Assessment of Strategies</li> <li>• CSR Implementation Profile for each goal</li> </ul>
By August 15, 2003	Submit to Division of Compensatory Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002-2003 CSR <u>Interim</u> Expenditure Report</li> <li>• 2003-2004 CSR <u>Interim</u> Budget</li> <li>• 2003-2004 CSR <u>Interim</u> Cash Request page</li> </ul>
September 2003	CSR Technical Assistance: Review 2002-2003 Evaluation Revise Profiles; Assessment Matrix;

	Summative Assessment of Strategies (alignment based on feedback from evaluation)
September 30, 2003	Complete CSR Final Expenditure Report for 2002-2003 funds
October 15 - 30, 2003	Submit to Division of Compensatory Education (if applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2002-2003 CSR Final Expenditure Report</li> <li>• Revised 2003-2004 CSR Budget (includes carryover amount from the previous year's total CSR funds)</li> <li>• Revised 2003-2004 CSR Cash Request page</li> </ul>

Schools that applied for but were not funded by CSRD also have opportunities to participate in technical assistance to increase their readiness level. This technical assistance leads the schools in self-evaluating their readiness in comparison to CSRD and Reading First expectations and identifying action steps to improve their school reform experience. For some schools, this may include continued participation or beginning participation in Indiana's Statewide System for School Support (school-wide planning, TAS, or Learning to Learn school support).

The annual timeline for Indiana CSRD activities is outlined below.

<b>Timeline</b>	<b>CSR Application Activities</b>
June-September	Identify potential CSRD schools from those who have (1) completed a structured school reform planning process, and (2) demonstrated a basic level of success in implementing school reform and assessing student impact from reform activities.
Mid-November	<u>Stage 1: Deadline for submission of interested schools' Preliminary CSRD Application</u> (1) copy of the school's current school improvement plan (2) documentation of the most recent performance assessment results, and (3) description of the school's involvement of staff in reform efforts
Late November	SEA completes the review of Preliminary CSRD Applications and identified schools meriting further CSRD consideration
End of November	Schools receiving 40+ rating on the Preliminary CSRD Application submit Notice of Intent (NOI)
Beginning of December	Technical Assistance for CSRD Proposal Writing (only Title I schools who qualified in the preliminary review and submitted NOI)
Mid-February	<u>Stage 2:</u> Identified schools submit completed CSRD proposal
Late February	The panel review process for rating proposals is completed, and site visits are scheduled with schools in final consideration for CSRD funding
March-April	<u>Stage 3:</u> Site visits are made to those schools that rated at the required levels in Stage 2.
Mid-May	The recommendation of the site visit team provides the final information needed before CSRD funding is awarded.
Mid-June	Initial two-day technical assistance for schools recently awarded a

Timeline	CSR Application Activities
	CSR grant. This technical assistance is focused on evaluation.
September	Statewide CSR meeting to share the previous year's CSR evaluation results and consider refinements needed.
November	Statewide first quarter meeting of CSR schools to address evaluation and implementation issues (Summative Assessment)
February	Statewide second quarter meeting of CSR schools to address evaluation and implementation issues (Summative Assessment)
May	Statewide third & fourth quarter meeting of CSR schools to address evaluation and implementation issues (Summative Assessment)
Various dates throughout the year	Technical assistance to schools in their first and second year of CSR implementation and to schools who applied for CSR but were not funded

The Indiana CSR evaluation design focuses on student impact and the process of school change (implementation) using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Data sources for student impact emphasize ISTEP+ assessment results (including cross-year comparisons with a matched set of schools) and school-based performance assessment results. Implementation assessment encompasses a school self-assessment of CSR progress, professional development data, and information on external technical assistance. The data is summarized and analyzed at the school level on the summative assessment form. The SEA involves consultants with expertise in quantitative and qualitative evaluation plans as well as assisting the SEA in collecting, summarizing and utilizing the statewide data. These data are also used to complete the annual Federal CSR evaluation report.

The data used for SEA evaluation will, in most instances, build from data collected for local CSR evaluation. The principal or his/her designee at each school will be responsible for collecting and organizing school-level evaluation data and submitting these data by the designated reporting date. Aggregation at the SEA level will be handled by SEA staff and evaluation consultants.

The CSR evaluation data, as well as other implementation and outcomes data, will be useful in the on-going refinement efforts of the CSR schools, their districts, their external providers and the SEA. The SEA's previously-described evaluation technical assistance will address common areas of interest related to this assessment design. Topics may include using disaggregated data to adjust instruction and support strategies for identified populations, refining program practices based on data, and ensuring an efficient and high quality assessment process. During technical assistance sessions with CSR schools, the school staff are supported by the SEA staff and/or evaluation consultants in identifying and considering specific adjustments indicated by an individual school's data. A summary of highlights from the State's CSR evaluation efforts is disseminated annually at the statewide September CSR meeting. The specific outline for Indiana's CSR evaluation is listed on the following charts.

Indiana CSRD Evaluation Plan (Impact Assessment)	
Key Questions	Data Sources
<i>Do CSRD schools make greater academic gains than comparable non-CSRD schools?</i>	<u>ISTEP+ assessment results</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Data available in SEA computer system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use data to identify 5 schools to “match” with each CSRD school (match based on SES/CSI index, school size, suburban/urban/rural, ethnicity patterns)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Compute means across the set of matched schools</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Compare CSRD schools to its matched schools’ mean on percentage of students passing (1) English/language arts, (2) mathematics, and (3) both English/language arts and mathematics</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Compare CSRD school to its matched schools’ mean on Title I school improvement results (% of Level 1 scores)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use same set of matched schools to follow longitudinal results across three (or more) years</li> </ul>
<i>Are all ISTEP+ grades/students in CSRD schools meeting or exceeding State standards in English/language arts and mathematics?</i>	<u>ISTEP+ assessment results*</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Data available in SEA computer system</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Use percentage of students passing (1) English/language arts, (2) mathematics, and (3) both English/language arts and mathematics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Disaggregate results of these variable based on gender, ethnicity, LEP, special education, mobility, low SES/not low SES and migrant education (<i>if applicable</i>)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Follow longitudinal results across three (or more) years</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>* This process will be changed to align with the state’s new school improvement categories once that process is initiated in 2002.</i></p>
<i>Are students in all grade levels in CSRD schools making progress toward State standards in English/language arts and mathematics?</i>	<u>School-based performance assessment results</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Annual report, using the summative assessment format, submitted to SEA</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Performance tasks linked to Indiana Academic Standards (<i>grade-level appropriate assessment tasks in reading, writing, and mathematics</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Performance tasks and “proficient” levels determined by each CSRD school</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> School summary and analysis of checkpoint data and end-of year data submitted in the summative assessment</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Summative assessment format provided by SEA</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<i>Has student attendance improved in CSRD schools?</i>	<u>School data in SEA computer system</u> <p>Compare attendance, as required by the state’s new school reform law, for each CSRD school</p>

<b>Indiana CSRD Evaluation Plan (Implementation Assessment)</b>	
<b>Key Questions</b>	<b>Data Sources</b>
<p><i>To what extent do CSRD schools implement their “ideal” designs?</i></p> <p><i>What factors differentiate schools that make implementation progress from other CSRD schools?</i></p>	<p><u>School Self-assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Using the school’s implementation profile developed as part of the CSRD application, the school indicates (initiating/early implementation/mid-level implementation/demonstration) level based on specified criteria (see attached draft format)</li> </ul>
<p><i>How does professional development support consistent, high quality classroom instruction?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ What types of professional development activities occur in CSRD schools, (e.g., training, collaboration, transfer of strategies)?</li> <li>❑ What types and intensity of external technical assistance support school change?</li> <li>❑ What instructional practices are consistently applied throughout the school as a result of professional development?</li> </ul>	<p><u>Summative Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Quarterly review of plan implementation</li> <li>❑ Quarterly review and analysis of implementation assessment data, (e.g., instructional hallway walks, instructional audits)</li> <li>❑ Quarterly documentation of professional development with staff attendance records</li> <li>❑ Quarterly documentation of external technical assistance</li> </ul>
<p><i>To what extent and with which strategies are schools able to involve families and community in their reform efforts?</i></p>	<p><u>Summative Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Quarterly review of plan implementation</li> <li>❑ Quarterly documentation of family and community involvement activities</li> </ul>
<p><i>What resources and expenditures support school change?</i></p>	<p><u>End-of-Year expenditure report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Line item expenditures according to funding sources and amounts expended</li> <li>❑ Categorized by salaries/fixed charges, professional development/TA, parent and community involvement, instructional supplies &amp; equipment, assessment, and other costs (specified by each school)</li> </ul>

**e. Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund—subgrants to eligible partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3)**

The State of Indiana is awaiting the release of the guidance regarding the ESEA Title II, Part A, Subpart 3 – Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships, which is currently being developed by the U.S. Department of Education. Following receipt of this guidance, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (SAHE for Indiana) in collaboration with the SEA will finalize a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Professional Development Partnership Program Competition. The RFP will focus on upgrading the expertise of teachers and other school staff to enable them to teach all children in the core academic subjects across all regions in Indiana. The RFP will be presented for discussion and approval at the Indiana Commission for Higher Education's (ICHE) public meeting in August 2002.

Following approval of the release of the RFP, the SAHE will provide a broad distribution of the RFP. The deadline for proposals will be late October 2002. Copies will also be sent to Indiana's public libraries, Service Centers, and appropriate professional associations. Copies will also be provided to the Indiana Department of Education for distribution in the Superintendent of Public Instruction's newsletter. As such, each superintendent in Indiana will receive a copy. In addition, a public notice will be placed in the Indianapolis Star newspaper for two weeks. A public notice will also be sent to the Indiana Donors Alliance for placement in their newsletter. Both the Indiana Donors Alliance and the SAHE will post copies of the RFP on their respective web sites.

Proposals received from the RFP will be reviewed by a team consisting of representatives from the following groups: 1) Indiana Local Education Agencies; 2) Indiana Institutions of Higher Education; 3) Indiana Department of Education; 4) Hoosier Association of Science Teachers; 5) Indiana State Teachers Association; 6) Indiana Professional Standards Board; and 7) Indiana Higher Education Telecommunications System.

The review will be a two-stage process. The initial stage will require the review team to provide an individual assessment of each proposal using a rubric and rating system. The second stage will involve a team meeting to discuss each proposal at length, and to tabulate reviewer's individual scores, so that a final group recommendation can be made to the SAHE. Specific attention will be given to ensuring that subgrants are equitably distributed across geographic regions in the State and/or subgrants serve eligible partnerships in all geographic regions in the State.

A ten-day appeal period will be implemented to allow applicants whose proposals are not recommended for funding time to request an appeals hearing with the SAHE.

The recommendations of the review team will be presented for approval at the SAHE's public meeting in December 2002. Award letters to applicants will immediately follow.

This process will be replicated for consecutive years of funding under Indiana's Consolidated State Application.

**f. Enhanced Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)**

1. The SEA's strategies for improving technology literacy will be based on the vision statement for the SEA technology plan: "Communities of learners are engaged in lifelong learning and are contributing members of the global and digital information world--learners who have problem-solving and higher-order critical thinking skills, information and communication skills, access to current and real-world information and tools, and mastery of core basic skills." Technology is not an add-on in Indiana schools. Technology and information literacy are embedded in the Indiana Academic Standards.

In awarding competitive grants, Indiana will give priority to applicants with the highest needs that are committed to implementing a high-quality, research-based program(s) with effective practices that improve student academic achievement. LEAs will be encouraged to form partnerships with LEAs, educational service centers, libraries and other agencies with technology expertise.

To determine eligible LEAs for competitive grants, the SEA has created a Technology Need Index that include the following criteria:

- Number and percentage of students in poverty;
- Number and percentage of students scoring below grade level in reading/language arts and mathematics on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+);
- Number and percentage of students for whom English is a second language; and
- Ratio of Assessed Valuation per student.

LEAs among the highest poverty districts in the state or any LEA identified as in need of improvement under Section 1116 of Title I, Part A (information will be provided by the Division of Federal Programs) will be pre-qualified to be eligible for the competitive funds.

A statewide grant announcement letter and application will be mailed to each school corporation superintendent and Educational Service Center. It will also be available on the Indiana No Child Left Behind website. Applications will be disseminated to eligible school corporations through comprehensive print distribution systems and will be available electronically on the Indiana Department of education website at <<http://www.doe.state.in.us>>. The SEA through regional consultation and electronic bulletin boards will provide technical assistance, during the application period.

The timeline for the grant process is as follows:

- The request for proposals (RFP) will be developed in August 2002
- The RFP will be distributed in October 2002;
- Technical assistance workshops will be available in November 2002;
- Proposals will be due in January 2003;



- Peer review of proposals conducted;
- Final review completed;
- Recommendations for funding prepared;
- LEAs will be notified in March 2003.

Competitive grant applications received by the SEA, are reviewed and scored by a committee composed of technology coordinators, curriculum and professional development specialists, SEA staff, teachers, and administrators. The scoring rubric assures that only those proposals with strong possibility of success will be awarded a competitive grant. During the grant period, constant technical assistance and oversight will be provided through structured training provided by the SEA.

In the competitive grant proposal LEAs will be asked to:

- Target specific academic needs as determined by student performance on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress–Plus (ISTEP+);
  - Identify and set areas for student performance improvement based on school improvement plan goals;
  - Discuss the provisions that will be made to ensure collaboration between teachers, parents, students, and community members for improved teaching and learning through technology;
  - Explain how EETT funds will be utilized to target student achievement of the Indiana Academic Standards in low-income and low-performing schools in their school system; and
  - Describe how EETT funds will be coordinated with other funding sources.
2. The Indiana DOE will work collaboratively with other agencies to ensure that all teachers have access to high quality instructional and professional development resources. The instructional resources include both print and non-print learning resources, are aligned with the Indiana Academic Standards for reading, language arts, social studies mathematics, and science and are available online at <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/asap>>.

Professional development is vital for building capacity in educators to ensure the implementation of learning technologies. Indiana will work with other agencies to disseminate professional development resources and provide on-going, hands-on, professional development workshops. Indiana has developed professional development resources that highlight Indiana school programs that illustrate best practices and demonstrate educators effectively integrating technology into the standards-based curriculum and increasing student achievement through the use of technology. The Eight Steps to Highly Effective 'Next Generation' Professional Development book and website <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/olr>>, support educators as they design effective professional development programs that target student-learning goals, align with school improvement plans, incorporate the use of technology, and meet the learning needs of teachers.

Indiana is working in partnership with experts at the national level, state and not-for-profit agencies and school level personnel on development of a print publication with an accompanying dynamic web site that examines the correlation between student achievement and library media and technology programs. Workshops for educators that provide information and strategies on improving student achievement through the use of library media and technology programs will be conducted throughout the state.

LEAs will receive on-going support and technical assistance to integrate technology planning into their district and school level school improvement plans where they will describe how their technology program goals and strategies will target academic achievement needs as defined by local performances on state standardized assessments.

3. The administrative funds from the EETT will be utilized in several key ways to further the goals established in the legislation and to implement the state's technology plan. Specifically, the funds will be used to:
  - Provide technology planning assistance to all LEAs, including specifically the high poverty and high technology-need schools;
  - Assist state and school personnel in increasing their knowledge of program evaluation;
  - Locate and disseminate assessment tools targeted to measure progress toward established performance goals related to the EETT program;
  - Provide additional professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators in high-technology need schools and districts;
  - Provide standards-based instructional resources that demonstrate effective technology integration;
  - Collect annual technology survey and inventory data of every school building in the state, analyze the data, and make a copy of the report available on the Department of Education website;
  - Develop and implement an assessment and evaluation system for EETT funding. This system will include baseline data, mid-term monitoring data and comprehensive final evaluation data of grant recipients to ensure that the funding is meeting the criteria established by the state; and
  - Provide two full-time DOE staff to administer EETT programs and to provide technical support to districts as programs are developed, implemented, and evaluated.

**g. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities—reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, section 4112)**

The Office of the Governor has designated the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA)/Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA) as administrator of the SDFSC Governor's Program.

### Timelines

The Division of Mental Health and Addiction awards contracts after a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The RFP process is established and overseen by the Indiana Department of Administration. Procedures for this process allow competitors six weeks to respond.

### Selection Criteria

The Division of Mental Health and Addiction selects programs through a competitive request-for-proposals process. As a part of this process, non-State government readers and agency personnel review and score proposals. Recommendations are made to the Indiana Department of Administration (DOA) for the candidate contractors. DOA makes the final decision. Both requests for proposals and resulting contracts require adherence to the Principles of Effectiveness.

DMHA focuses on environmental promotion of academic achievement. Selection criteria give priority to programs, that promote violence and drug use and abuse prevention and a drug-free lifestyle. Programs provided in the school community also promote school attendance by requiring student participants to be enrolled in and attend school.

### Priorities for Program

Before the State announces its intent to offer a request for proposals, two bodies review programs to be funded through the Governor's Program to ensure that program priorities are consistent with the state's goals. These bodies review and approve program priorities: (1) Indiana's Interagency Council on Drugs, which is established by statute and composed of the heads of agencies with authority over drug-related issues, and (2) the Mental Health Promotion and Addiction Prevention Committee, which is composed of citizens.

The Governor's Program will not duplicate school-based youth substance use and abuse or violence prevention programs. The Governor's Program will support services to school-age youth with certain risks not addressed in the school program. The activities will be provided outside regular school hours through services in the school community and through supportive activities and training of organizations that are members of Indiana's prevention system.

## **h. Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126)**

### Timeline

July – August	2002	Research community service programs to refine program focus
September	2002	Complete internal contract process
October	2002	Select contractors
January	2003	Allocate funding to contractors

### Selection Criteria

The following criteria will be used for selecting LEAs, community-based organizations (CBOs), or a consortium to carry out Community Service Grant activities:

1. LEAs/CBOs/consortia that have the capacity to address the priorities of the Indiana Department of Education for the Community Service program.
2. LEAs/CBOs/consortia that serve suspended or expelled students with a demonstrated need for services.
3. LEAs/CBOs/consortia that have the capacity to have the greatest impact on students in need of Community Service programming.
4. LEAs/CBOs/consortia that have previous experience with community service programs.
5. LEAs/CBOs/consortia that have the ability to continue the program beyond the project period.

### Priorities

The priorities of the Indiana Department of Education for Community Service Grants will be to:

- Provide students with an opportunity to develop positive connections with their school and their community.
- Develop connections between schools and community-based organizations to foster discipline and build character in students.
- Offer alternatives beyond being alone at home for students facing suspension or expulsion that are positive for the students and the community.
- Keep students in school, engaged in the educational process and striving for academic success.

#### **i. 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)**

Indiana will award 95 percent of its 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC allotment competitively in the form of grants to eligible entities. Two percent of funding will be used for state level program administration; establishing and implementing a peer review process; and supervising the awarding of funds to eligible entities.

The State will use 3 percent of the allotted funds for monitoring grantees; providing capacity building, training, and technical assistance; conducting comprehensive evaluation on the effectiveness of the program; and providing training and technical assistance to grant applicants and award recipients.

Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) will develop the subgrant application guidelines in consultation with the Governor and the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Board of Advisors. The Board is composed of individuals from across the State invited to be part of the subgrant development process by the Chief State School Officer. They are as follows:

1. Current 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Program Directors

- Laurie Berkshire – Anderson Community Schools program (community-based organization)
  - Thomas L. Neat – Elkhart Community Schools
  - Dan Diehl – Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation
  - Herb Higgin – Michigan City Area Schools
2. Title 1 Administrator – Gloria Donovan – Madison Consolidated Schools
  3. ESL Teacher – Trish Morita Mullaney – Forest Glen Elementary School
  4. Community Center Administrator – Olgen Williams – Christamore House
  5. Informal Learning Specialist – Mary Fortney – Children’s Museum of Indianapolis
  6. EvenStart Administrator – Linda Hogan – Indianapolis Public Schools
  7. State Agency Representative – Nikki Kincaid – Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
  8. State Student Attendance Officer and Student Advocate – Gaylon Nettles – Indiana Department of Education
  9. School and Community Nutrition Consultant – Karen Edwards – Indiana Department of Education
  10. Charitable Organization Executive – Louis Lopez – United Way of Central Indiana
  11. School Transportation Director – Frank Misner – Clay Community Schools
  12. High School Teacher – Vicky Winkler – Heritage Hills High School
  13. Faith-based Organization – Phil Mitchell – New Salem United Methodist Church
  14. Parent – letter of invitation sent – reply not yet received

Application information and forms will be disseminated statewide to school corporations, community-based organizations, other public and private organizations, and parties that have expressed interest in the program through a statewide postal and electronic mailing campaign. This campaign will be coordinated by IDOE with mailing lists from other state agencies, community-based organizations, and interdepartmentally with the Title 1 and Migrant/Language Minority divisions. An internet site with an informational Q&A section and downloadable information and application forms will be created.

From October through December 2002, IDOE will conduct application workshops in strategic locations in the northern, central and southern parts of the State. These workshops will provide information and technical assistance needed to prepare subgrant proposals. The agenda of each workshop will include an overview of the program, technical assistance on the subgrant application process, and feature invited speakers - practitioners of 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs who will talk about their respective program practices and experiences, as well as on collaboration, sustainability, and training issues. A packet containing forms, application guidelines, and resource information about high quality before- and after-school programs will be provided to each participant.

Subgrant applications must be received by IDOE no later than December 31, 2002. Grants will be awarded March 31, 2003.

IDOE will bring its resources together with those of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program to provide high quality professional development and technical assistance to 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC subgrantees.

Over the next few years, this work will be guided by the following objectives: IDOE will:

- provide subgrantees with information and the technical support needed in identifying and implementing effective instructional programs and practices based on scientific research and provide assistance for planning and implementing such programs and practices;
- provide on-going technical assistance to ensure the use of research-based material, the adoption of literacy services for families of students, and a system of support is in place.
- ensure that grant funds are effectively coordinated and integrated with existing state and federal activities.
- evaluate and document what works and why, and disseminate that information.

IDOE plans to conduct a mandatory intensive summer institute in 2003 for subgrantees where the objectives mentioned above will be covered.

IDOE will conduct state-sponsored technical assistance and professional development workshops three times a year and require that subgrantees attend at least one.

IDOE will also seek assistance from and coordinate and consult with the organizations that have formed unique collaborative partnerships with the US Department of Education and which had laid the groundwork for the training and technical assistance for the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program. The subgrant guidelines will encourage applicants to include funding in their budgets to participate in training conferences sponsored by the National Center for Community Education (NCCE).

IDOE is the publisher of a document (contracted with Indiana Education Policy Center and distributed to all Indiana schools at the time of publication) – which studied professional development in Indiana entitled *Learning Together: Professional Development for Better Schools*. The five principles stressed in this study are: (1) effective professional development is school based; (2) effective professional development uses coaching and other follow-up procedures; (3) effective professional development is collaborative; (4) effective professional development is embedded in the daily lives of teachers, providing for continuous growth; and (5) effective professional development focuses on student learning and is evaluated at least in part on that basis. SEA grants that support staff and professional development are built, more or less, on these five principles.

IDOE plans to contact the Indiana Center for Family and Community Partnerships and other organizations representing parents and guardians and to seek their assistance in developing a program strategy to promote parental and community participation in schools.

Periodic program monitoring will be conducted through site visitations by 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC staff, regular email/telephone contact, and collecting program/fiscal reports on a quarterly and annual basis.

The state of Indiana monitors student achievement through the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP+) – statewide assessment of reading and mathematics for Grades 3, 6, 8 and 10.

21<sup>st</sup> CCLC programs will be monitored annually. State funds will be withheld from 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers projects where students fail to make academic progress or achieve program goals.

The subgrant application review process will be conducted independently and managed by an Independent Review Coordinator. Indiana 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC personnel will not review the application. Reviewers will be experienced individuals from Indiana. They will include (1) educators with experience in elevating achievement in poverty environments; (2) representatives of community-based organizations with experience in providing youth programs; (3) school administrators; (4) informal learning experts; and (5) state government representatives. The reviewers will work in teams. An additional review will be done if the team of reviewers cannot reconcile their scores. The Review Coordinator will conduct a review audit to provide further quality control. The reviewers will use a rubric to score the subgrants. A 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC Board of Advisors, consisting of representatives from divisions of the Indiana Department of Education involved in extended school/community partnerships and assessment/accountability, business and community stakeholders, and previous Federal 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grantees not involved in the current subgrant process, will rank the data and determine if site visits are necessary based upon the reviewers' request for more information concerning a specific proposal. Following any needed site visits, the Board of Advisors will meet again to include the site visit information and the budget recommendations from the reviewers. Final approval will be made after any program or budget negotiations are completed.

IDOE plans to contract for a comprehensive evaluation of the entire project conducted by an independent evaluator. The Department will issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to experienced evaluators. The RFP for the independent evaluator will be issued in accordance with State procurement guidelines. IDOE 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC staff and the Board of Advisors will have input on the selection process.

### Timelines

#### May 2002

- State Superintendent of Public Instruction will announce names of individuals who will comprise the program's advisory committee

#### June 2002

- Submit required parts of state plan with the Consolidated State Application package
- Develop website
- Develop Rubric and Subgrant selection process

July 2002

- Conduct consultation meetings with the advisory committee on details of implementation of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC

August/September 2002

- Refine the grant competition process including:
  - Application
  - Q & A
  - Technical Assistance Program
- Refine the review process
- Work with foundations for assistance in developing a training program
- Disseminate the subgrant application information

October/December 2002

- Conduct training and technical assistance for preparing applicants to write 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC proposals
- Conduct training for grant reviewers
- Contract with grant evaluator

December 31, 2002

- Due date for 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC sub grant applications

January/February 2003

- Conduct the review process

March 1, 2003

- Grant award notification

Summer 2003

- Conduct training and technical assistance for subgrantees

September 2003

- Provide monitoring and technical assistance to subgrantees
- Provide training for subgrantees

Selection criteria, priorities and how they promote student achievement

Each application will be read by a panel of three reviewers using a numeric rating scale with a maximum of 100 points as indicated for each of the items described below:

**Absolute Priority** – Community Learning Centers will primarily serve students who attend schools eligible for Title I schoolwide programs (at least 40percent qualify for free/reduced lunch) or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low income families.

**Competitive Priority (10 points)** will be given to projects that will serve children who attend schools in need of improvement under Section 1116 of Title I and submitted jointly by the school district receiving Title I funds and community-based organizations or public or private organizations.

**Transportation - (10 points)**

- How will the students travel safely to and from the center and home?

**Communication – (5 points)**



- How will the organization disseminate information about the center (including its location) to the community in a manner that is understandable and accessible?

**Learning and Achievement – (25 points)**

- How are the activities expected to improve student achievement?

**Coordination – (5 points)**

- What Federal, State, and local programs will be combined with the proposed program for the most effective use of public resources? Are plans outlined on steps applicant will take to coordinate 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC funds with these sources?

**Program Effectiveness – (25 points)**

- How will the program meet principles of effectiveness based on the following:
  - An assessment of objective data regarding need for the before-and after-school programs (including during summer recess periods) and activities in the schools and communities;
  - An established set of performance measures aimed at ensuring the availability of high-quality academic enrichment opportunities;
  - If appropriate, scientifically based research that provides evidence that the program or activity will help students meet State and local student academic achievement standards; and
  - Work plan and activities are aligned with goals.

**Need (10 points)**

- An evaluation of the community needs and available resources for the community learning center and a description of how the proposed program in the center will address those needs (including the needs of working families).

**Promise (10 points)**

- The eligible organization's experience, or promise of success, in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement, and positive youth development of students.

The program has the potential to enrich the quality of the targeted students' academic skills. It will enable the students to build upon and further explore reading, math, and science through various enrichment activities. They can investigate more deeply topics of interest, perform extended hands-on projects, and use computers and other technological instruments to help interest them in other areas.

Extended learning time and personal attention can improve students' reading and mathematical performance. After school tutoring provides students with supplementary learning time that can help them keep pace with classroom instruction and stay on track for more rigorous academic work.

Learning centers can partner with a host of community organizations to recruit capable and enthusiastic adults with expertise in reading, math, and science. Businesses, professional associations, and college students can also be called upon not only to help improve student achievement but to act as mentors and role models for all program participants.

### **3. Describe how the State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees.**

The State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the State's (and those entities' own) performance goals and objectives.

#### **Monitoring**

During the application process, prospective competitive subgrant recipients have access to grant workshops, grant guidance materials, and technical assistance from program experts. Competitive subgrant applicants undergo an extensive application and panel review process. Panel reviewers are selected for their expertise and receive extensive training to ensure rater reliability prior to their involvement in the review process. Subgrant applicants identified by review teams for final consideration also receive on-site visits to confirm and clarify panel recommendations prior to funding approval.

Monitoring of individual formula ESEA programs begins with the application review process. With Indiana's shift from on-site compliance monitoring to a focus on program effectiveness, the SEA redoubled its efforts to ensure that ESEA applications receive rigorous desk-top programmatic and fiscal reviews. The application review process for some programs (e.g., Title I) also involve highly-trained, expert practitioner review members. All program application reviews rely on extended consultation via telephone and e-mail prior to approval. Beyond that, Department program consultants, external consultants, and administrative staff provide on-going technical assistance and support during the amendment process and throughout the duration of program grants. While statewide, annual on-site compliance visits are no longer the norm, on-site monitoring occurs across the various ESEA programs. For example, under Title V, high-need districts will be given priority when establishing the monitoring schedule. Programs examined on-site will be reviewed for effectiveness, as well as to determine whether progress towards State and local performance goals and objectives have been met.

Over the next several months, the SEA will work to dramatically change its LEA application approval process. Our goal is to enable all districts to electronically submit LEA consolidated applications/plans for SY 2003-04. The Department also plans to *substantially* reduce the level of documentation submitted to the Indiana Department of Education, thereby simplifying the review and approval process. Such a shift will permit the state to consider moving to a consolidated on-site monitoring process. We envision such a process focusing primarily on districts consistently failing to demonstrate adequate yearly progress on established program goals. The focus of a consolidated monitoring process would likely include the following:

- using ISTEP+ data analysis and a comprehensive examination of instructional practices to focus professional development efforts;
- ensuring effective and appropriate uses of ESEA program funds;
- aligning financial reporting mechanisms among ESEA programs with expectations of the State Board of Accounts;

- promoting and supporting the use of new transferability provisions;
- reviewing instructional staff qualifications and the focus of professional development;
- ensuring the alignment of instruction with the Indiana 2000 academic standards;
- employing scientific research based instructional strategiesBparticularly as they relate to reading; and
- implementing local systems for ongoing assessment of the process for improved academic achievement.

### **Professional Development**

During the 1999 and 2001 budget sessions of the Indiana General Assembly, the Department asked for the addition of five Aeducator@days for professional development. The request was not enacted, but the General Assembly appropriated \$16.25 million for *professional development grants* for the 2002-03 school year. Unfortunately, a 15 percent cut in professional development funds is anticipated due to a State budget crisis.

Nearly 2,000 Indiana schools will be submitting *school improvement plans* (SIPS) to the Indiana Department of Education on or before June 30, 2002 as required under the Indiana General Assembly's Public Law 221 of 1997. An effective school improvement planning process allows Indiana schools to develop a strategic and continuous plan focused on quality education and high levels of student achievement. The required components of the school improvement plan may be viewed at <<http://doe.state.in.us/asap/sip.html>>.

A *professional development program* is a required component of each school's improvement plan. It is to be aligned with local data and focused on assisting teachers in meeting the identified needs of a diverse and ever-changing student population. Core principles for effective professional development have been adopted (consistent with the NCLB definition) by the Indiana State Board of Education and may be referenced at <<http://doe.state.in.us/asap/prodev.html>>.

### **Professional Development and Technical Assistance**

SEA professional development and technical assistance efforts will be directly linked to the five goals and specified indicators established in the SEA's consolidated application, as well as priorities identified through the data analysis of statewide ISTEP+ results. Yearly conferences, annual administrative meetings, workshops, and regional training will be focused on issues related to the programs funded under ESEA. These will be developed and conducted in partnerships with representative of: local educational agencies; institutions of higher education; professional associations; community-based organizations; education services centers; and other state agencies. Priority emphasis of all activities will focus on high poverty, low-performing districts and schools B with special emphasis on closing identified achievement gaps among student subgroups.

Once a student's weaknesses have been identified through ISTEP+, it is imperative to provide additional instructional opportunities for the students. During the 2001-02 school year, \$25,149,730 was spent specifically to provide *additional instructional opportunities* to

students through ISTEP+ Remediation and Preventive Remediation Grants. Similar opportunities will be available during school year 2002-03, but funding levels are uncertain due to budget crisis issues currently facing our state.

Printed publications, internet resources, and multi-media resources (online video-streaming, ASAP web access, etc.) will be accessible and will include best practices, guidelines, and question/answer documents. Indiana's academic standards set forth rigorous expectations for all Hoosier students. In an effort to help teachers align instruction to these standards and to help teachers evaluate students' progress toward meeting the standards, the Department is developing and providing *Curriculum Frameworks and Diagnostic Assessments* for Grades K-12 in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. Teachers can use these resources as integrated tools that are matched to specific indicators. They serve as optional, adaptable supplements to teachers' current curricula. The Curriculum Frameworks are made available as they are developed and immediately available on the Department's web site <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/standards>>. The Frameworks include: a curriculum inventory worksheet; standards development across grade levels; instructional activities; and black line masters for instructional activities. The Diagnostic Assessments are designed for teachers to measure what students know and what they need to learn in relation to the academic standards. Designed as supplements to classroom assessment, the Diagnostics integrate with Indiana's Curriculum Frameworks. They include: items aligned with the academic standards; teacher scoring guides; diagnostic assessments; and diagnostic recording sheets.

The Department recently introduced a new website called *ASAP* which stands for Accountability System for Academic Progress. This high-tech response to the need for enhanced access to educational data is especially useful to school administrators, school boards, parents, and citizens. It enables users to chart the progress of Indiana schools as they seek to meet school improvement and accountability provisions. The ASAP site is divided into eight categories related to users' needs. The eight categories are: Academic Standards; Accountability; Accreditation; Best Practices; Professional Development; School Data; School Improvement Planning; and State Aims and Goals. The site provides reliable, easy-to-understand information about student achievement and school performance, as well as offering teachers new opportunities to align curriculum and instruction with Indiana's academic standards. Users can generate graphs, tables, and charts based on their data analysis request at web site <<http://doe.state.in.us/asap/welcome.html>>.

Information will be widely disseminated on the national and state goals and adopted State performance indicators as well as the framework for accountability in meeting those goals. A comprehensive *Indiana NCLB website* is under development and will be continuously updated for statewide access. The Department will promote the regulations governing the uses of NCLB funds, as well as the flexibility provisions of the law, best practices **B** most especially those scientifically research based.

The Department, in collaboration with internal and external expert partners, will provide educators instructional strategies based on *scientific research* for teaching reading at the

elementary, middle, and high school levels. Summer institutes and academies on effective reading and writing practices are scheduled. Scientific research for teaching reading will be aligned in the intensive support systems for CSR, SWP, TAS as well as efforts related to I-READ and the state's Reading First Plan. Confirmed topics and presenters include:

- Jean Osborn, University of Illinois, *Helping Every Child Become an Avid Reader*
- Karen Harris, University of Maryland, *The Reading-Writing Connection through Strategy Instruction*
- Marsha Roit, Kathy Cooper, Sharon Van Vleck, *Reading Skills Workshop*
- Steve Graham, University of Maryland, *The Spelling-Reading Connection*
- Lesley Morrow, *Organizing and Managing the Language Arts Block*
- Roger Farr, Indiana University, *Early Literacy Assessment*
- Camille Blachowicz, *Research-Based Vocabulary Instruction*
- Donna Ogle, National Louis University, *Reading Informational Texts*
- Michael Pressley, University of Notre Dame, *Balanced Literacy Instruction; Comprehension Instruction*
- Ruth Wharton-McDonald, University of New Hampshire, *Exemplary Instruction in First Grade*
- Pat Cunningham, *Multilevel Instruction*
- Jim Cunningham, *What We Know About How to Teach Phonics*
- Cathy Collins Black, *Comprehension Instruction That Makes a Difference in Students=Lives*
- Presentations by Guilford Publishers, Jamestown Education Publishing, Open Court Publishing
- Richard Allington, University of Florida, *What Really Matters for Struggling Readers*

Over the past ten years, Indiana's public schools have experienced a 200 percent increase in its number of language minority students. Many teachers require professional development to learn instructional techniques and cultural knowledge to work with *limited English proficient students*. The Language Education Department at Indiana University, in collaboration with the Department annually offers a Summer Language Minority Institute. The institute trains ESL, bilingual, and regular classroom teachers—as well as graduate and undergraduate students. During the summer of 2002, the institute will reach students at campuses including IU Bloomington, IU Northwest, IU South Bend, Elkhart Center, IU East, IUPUI Fort Wayne, and IUPUI Columbus via two-way interactive television. Two sessions are offered: June 14-July 2 and July 5-23, 2002. The Department also will host its second annual K-12 ESL conference in 2002-03 for more than 500 educators from across the state.

Indiana recognizes the importance of school leadership in improving student achievement. Since 1985, through the Indiana General Assembly, the Department administers its national model for the training of principals as leaders of instructors. The *Indiana Principal Leadership Academy* (IPLA) empowers principals with effective behaviors and proficiencies. Graduates of IPLA set the pace for statewide educational improvement and reform, and are recognized as exemplary educational leaders in Indiana and throughout the nation.

The Indiana Department of Education provides a unique professional development program to address the school safety needs of LEAs. In 1999 the Indiana General Assembly charged the Indiana Department of Education with developing and implementing training and certification for school safety specialists who were designated by each public school superintendent. The Department has since instituted the *Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy* (ISSSA). This professional development program has provided Indiana with an opportunity to have over 600 School Safety Specialists trained to ensure that schools in Indiana are safe and orderly environments.

The Office of Student Services manages the Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy for the Department and has coordinated with the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute in the development of the ISSSA's curriculum. The curriculum includes two levels of training, basic and advanced. Through the basic training, the LEA designee must attend two training sessions during the school year and complete five required activities and the on-line Safe Schools Healthy Kids 2 program. To continue to be certified as a School Safety Specialist each designee must complete the advanced training which requires attendance at two sessions each year. The Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy web site can be accessed at <<http://doe.state.in.us/issas/welcome.html>>.

**4. Describe the Statewide system of support under section 1117 to ensure that all schools meet the State's academic content and student achievement standards, including how the State will provide assistance to low-performing schools.**

Under NCLB, states are required to provide a Statewide system of support for all schools—including systems targeted to low-performing schools. Although still under development, Indiana is well-positioned to address these requirements through components for effective schools established under existing laws:

- Support systems for high-poverty, low-performing SWP and CSR schools required under the federal Improving America's Schools Act of 1994; and
- Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plans required under Indiana's accountability legislation, Public Law 221 of 1997.

The following table provides a side-by-side comparison of existing requirements that lay the foundation for Indiana's Statewide system of support required under section 1117 of NCLB.

Required Component	SWP/TAS/CSR (Reading First will be aligned with an emphasis on Reading K-3 & transfer or transitional strategies for grades 4-6)	Indiana P.L.221	Compare & Contrast
<b>Focus of the Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Aligned components for effective school functioning, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instruction</li> <li>• Curriculum</li> <li>• Assessment</li> <li>• Classroom management</li> <li>• Professional development</li> <li>• Parent involvement</li> <li>• School organization/management</li> <li>• Technology</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ a 3-year plan for strategic and continuous school improvement and achievement, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a description of <u>curriculum &amp; instruction</u>,</li> <li>• <u>assessments</u> to be used in addition to ISTEP+,</li> <li>• provision for a <u>safe &amp; disciplined learning environment</u>,</li> <li>• provision for on-going <u>professional development</u> activities,</li> <li>• provision to maximize <u>parental participation</u>, and</li> <li>• provision for coordination of <u>technology</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The required components for TAS/SWP/CSR process and a P.L.221 plan parallel each other.</p> <p>TAS/SWP/CSR process requires that a school plan focus on student attainment of State standards. Currently, ISTEP+ measures whether students have attained expected standards by grades 3, 6, 8, and 10.</p>
<b>School Improvement Goals &amp; Strategies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ ground the school improvement design in a comprehensive needs assessment; and</li> <li>✓ Set goals and annual benchmarks for a 3-year period to address the identified priority needs using...               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• research-based strategies and proven methods for student learning, teaching and school management that are</li> <li>• based on reliable research and effective practices, aligned with the State's Academic Standards and have been replicated successfully in schools with diverse characteristics</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ collect multiple forms of data that reflect the achievement...of all students, i.e., ISTEP+, local tests, teacher and administrator observations</li> <li>✓ set objectives based on the data reflecting the learning needs of students</li> <li>✓ set benchmarks for achievement of these objectives over 3-year period.</li> </ul>	<p>These P.L.221 requirements parallel TAS/SWP/CSR requirements</p> <p>IC20-1-1-6.5 of P.L.221 requires that student learning and performance is the emphasis, with a primary focus on state and local Academic Standards. It further requires that a plan is based on an analysis of data regarding student learning needs, professional literature, research and school improvement designs .</p>

Required Component	SWP/TAS/CSR (Reading First will be aligned with an emphasis on Reading K-3 & transfer or transitional strategies for grades 4-6)	Indiana P.L.221	Compare & Contrast
<b>Professional Development and Technical Assistance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ High quality and continuous professional development and training for teachers and staff</li> <li>✓ Professional development in Indiana TAS/CSR/SWP schools is expected to focus on the school's goals and strategies and to provide opportunities for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• staff collaboration,</li> <li>• whole staff, small group and individual learning,</li> <li>• support for transfer-to-classroom</li> <li>• a variety of adult learning strategies</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ high-quality, ongoing external technical assistance with experience and/or expertise in comprehensive school reform and improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ A program for high quality professional development that is integrated with the school's strategic and continuous improvement and achievement plan and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has a primary focus on state and local Academic Standards;</li> <li>• enables teachers to improve expertise in subject knowledge and teaching strategies;</li> <li>• aligns standards, curriculum and assessment; and</li> <li>• includes measurement activities to ensure the transfer of knowledge and skills to classroom</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ A school's professional development program must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adequate time and job-embedded opportunities,</li> <li>• effective, research-based strategies, and</li> <li>• diverse techniques, including inquiry, reflection, action research, networking, study group, coaching and evaluation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The expectations for quality professional development under TAS/SWP/CSR and P.L.221 are similar.</p> <p>The TAS/SWP/CSR <b>Professional Development Instructional Audit, Hallway Walk</b> and the <b>Professional Development Continuum</b> are examples of measurement activities (tools to ensure transfer of skills to classroom instruction).</p>
<b>Assessment and Accountability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ measurable goals for student performance tied to (ISTEP+)</li> <li>✓ annual benchmarks toward meeting the goals</li> <li>✓ evaluation of the implementation of school reforms and the impact on student achievement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Annually review and revise the plan. The plan must include benchmarks and indicators of performance that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• use ISTEP+ results/proficiency reports</li> <li>• use other "improvement" criteria as secondary measures of performance progress</li> <li>• demonstrates progress toward meeting performance criteria</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ A school will be identified for a school improvement category based on the school's ISTEP+ scores and a school performance index.</li> </ul>	<p>Both TAS/SWP/CSR and P.L.221 require benchmarks and annual review of progress toward meeting goals. ISTEP+ results must be part of this review.</p> <p>TAS/SWP/CSR schools are required to use performance assessment of all students. These data would be applicable to the annual review of progress expected in P.L.221.</p> <p>TAS/SWP requires evaluation of the school's implementation of its reform plan while P.L. 221 requires assessment of transfer of new knowledge and skills of the classroom.</p>



Decisions for consolidating systems of support for all public schools and school corporations failing to demonstrate adequate yearly progress (AYP) will be finalized over the next several months. The Department will involve local district representatives, regional education service center directors, and association representatives in the development of its final support system.

The statewide support system will use resources from the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the Indiana Staff Development Council, Region VII Comprehensive Assistance Center, and others knowledgeable about scientifically-based research and practice on teaching and learning about successful programs, reform, and improvement opportunities for low-achieving students.

State superintendent, Dr. Suellen Reed, has invited NCREL and CCSSO to collaborate with Indiana in its development of support and technical assistance services to low-performing schools and districts. CCSSO and NCREL jointly recommend that we convene a Task Force to determine the model for technical assistance that Indiana will pursue. The following activities to be conducted by NCREL and CCSSO will support the work of this Task Force:

- Prepare background materials for consideration by the Task Force regarding research-based information on effective programs and best practices critical to the success of the Task Force's decisions.
- Work with IDOE staff to review existing technical assistance activities and identify additional resources needed.
- Conduct three regional focus groups of constituenciesBgeographically representative of the state--such as superintendents, principals, teachers, unions representing educational personnel, business leaders, school boards, parents, and community members.
- Work with the State Education Policy Network to conduct a focus group with state policy makers, including the Governor and/or his key staff, state legislators and legislative staff, the State Board of Education, and the Indiana Department of Education.
- Consult with practitioners in states that have demonstrated success in providing technical assistance to low-performing schools; bring the key experts to meet with the Task Force.

It is anticipated that Indiana's Statewide support system will include:

- Designating and using distinguished teachers, principals, and educators to provide leadership and support to schools/districts in need of improvement.
- Using other approaches and entities such as higher education institutions, consortia of LEAs organized by education service centers, or private technical assistance providers.
- Employing technology as a vehicle for professional development in core content areas.
- Establishing and providing assistance to school support teams to help schools and districts in need of improvement. This support system will embrace many of the

strategies embedded within the Title I statewide support system described in item 5a. Depending on the level of identified need, a tiered approach layering services by degree of need will most likely occur. This tiered approach is illustrated in the examples below:

1. Priority 1 Schools/Districts: schools/districts that have failed to meet AYP for four or more consecutive years. Such schools/districts would receive the most intensive and sustained services through the resources of the State's support system. At a minimum, this would likely include: strategies for using data to drive decision-making/goal setting; systems for conducting comprehensive needs assessments; aligning professional development efforts with focused, continuous activities linked to instructional practice and student achievement; strategies for embedding professional development activities into the school day/week/month; developing systems for monitoring the effectiveness of instructional strategies and student learning; access to scientifically-based research~~B~~ particularly in the content area of reading.
2. Priority 2 Schools/Districts: schools/districts that have failed to meet AYP for three consecutive years.
3. Priority 3 Schools/Districts: schools/districts that have failed to meet AYP for two consecutive years.
4. On-going Priority Schools: The statewide system of support under Title I and I-READ/Reading First will continue for targeted populations, most specifically high-poverty, low-performing schools. Examples of such efforts include systems for supporting CSR schools, Title I schoolwide programs, and Apilot@TAS projects. The SEA will continue to provide intensive, sustained technical assistance opportunities to support and sustain improved student achievement in these schools.

## 5. Describe activities the state will conduct to —

### a. Help Title I schools make effective use of schoolwide programs.

#### Statewide Support System for Title I School Improvement *Planning* Schools

This school support system provides services to Title I schools choosing to plan for Schoolwide, as well as support for Targeted Assistance Schools in need of improvement. Year 1 Planning is described below and this system of support includes five key components.

1. A school improvement planning **overview meeting** is held during the spring for representatives from all districts and buildings eligible for Title I SWP as well as targeted assistance schools with less than 40percent poverty in need of improvement. Eligibility for SWP participation is based on a poverty level equal to or greater than 40 percent and the decision of the school staff to participate in the state's school-wide planning process.

2. School improvement ***planning team meetings*** are held four times during the school year in Indianapolis. Each participating school sends a team of six to eight members, consisting of the following: principal, Title I program administrator or district coordinator or other district staff member, Title I-funded building staff, parents, and building level teachers representing various grades or disciplines. Each team meeting focuses on a specific aspect of the continuous improvement planning process:

July/August — Emphasis is on the *comprehensive needs assessment* process (two day workshop). Consultants reinforce the steps and processes for conducting a comprehensive needs assessment, interpreting ISTEP+ test reports, analyzing student performance data, and writing findings. School teams develop specific plans for conducting their comprehensive needs assessments.

October/November — Emphasis is on the *inquiry process* (two day workshop). Schools begin to consider research-based effective practices that have potential for addressing their needs. Consultants reinforce the steps for the inquiry process and model using a number of tools for organizing and sharing a team's inquiry findings.

January — Emphasis is on completing the inquiry process and developing goals and strategies (two day workshop). Participants will share outcomes from initial steps in the inquiry process; develop a process for reviewing current programming related to effective practices and guiding principles identified through inquiry; link effective practices/guiding principles to key findings from the comprehensive needs assessment; learn strategies for developing school-wide goals and strategies; and learn to use tools for reaching consensus and making decisions.

April — Emphasis is on finalizing *and operationalizing the draft school improvement plan* (two-day workshop). Participants share draft goals and strategies, discuss systems for monitoring student performance, and plan for implementation on an ongoing basis. Consultants introduce frameworks for formative assessment and professional development.

3. Four school-wide program planning ***networking seminars*** are held in July/August, October/November, January and April. Administrators from schools and districts operating successful SWPs are featured presenters at each leadership seminar. Each seminar highlights Qs & As with these practitioners and focuses on issues and conditions facing high poverty schools as well as strategies that administrators can use to facilitate the improvement planning process and strengthen team building efforts.
4. Five ***on-site technical assistance visits*** are held at each participating school: two visits between August and October; one visit between October and January; one visit January through April; and one visit between April through June 30 (some schools receive an additional visit if necessary during this period). All schools receive five full-day on-sites that include strategies for coaching, mentoring and demonstrations. The technical assistance team meets with the school improvement planning team and district staff to respond to their unique needs and monitor the planning process. The foci for the five visits are:

- a. supporting the comprehensive needs assessment process, analyzing student performance data (e.g., strengths/weaknesses related to State standards), using school mission/vision to identify local priorities, and developing plans for completing the comprehensive needs assessment;
  - b. monitoring the inquiry process, using information and findings from the needs assessment, and moving from the exploration to the focus stage of inquiry;
  - c. developing drafts of goals and strategies, monitoring team building and ownership, and overseeing the needs-based decision-making process; and
  - d. reviewing the school improvement draft plan and providing assistance in drafting action plans to finalize and operationalize the school improvement plan, with a focus on performance assessment and professional development components.
5. A **notebook system** is used to document and support the planning process. One notebook holds planning resources and tools, e.g., key research, professional journal articles, government reports, legal requirements, forms, and advanced organizers. A second notebook is used for organizing and revising sections of the developing school improvement plan throughout the year.

#### Statewide Support System for Title I Year 1 Implementing Schools

This school support system provides services to schools in Year 1 Implementing. These schools were involved in the 2001-2002 School Support System for Indiana. After one year of planning for school improvement, these schools receive continued school support during their first year of implementing their school plan. Schools implementing school improvement plans receive two 2-day group meetings during the year, and each school receives four full-day on-site technical assistance visits. During the team meetings, the consultants assist the school teams in conducting an ongoing process for (1) monitoring the implementation of the school improvement plan and (2) assessing the impact on student achievement. Teams also receive opportunities to share information with one another. Team meetings focus on data collection tools/process, analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, use of rubrics, formative and summative assessment processes. Emphasis is also on writing, early child/observation-based assessment and performance-based assessments. Consultants facilitate checkpoints and staff meetings on site, modeling use of KWLs to analyze data and report to staff.

#### Statewide Support System for Title I Year 2 Implementing Schools

This school support system provides services to schools in Year 2 Implementing. These schools were involved in the School Support System for Indiana as planning and Year I Implementing schools. Consultants will conduct two 2-day group meetings during the year. Each Year 2 Implementing school will receive 3 on-site technical assistance visits. Schools receive full-day technical assistance visits.

*On-site technical assistance visits* are made to each participating school. Consultants assist teams in auditing their implementation monitoring process: 1) reviewing and revising data collection, summarization, and analysis practices and 2)

setting/strengthening benchmarks. Consultants facilitate checkpoints and staff meetings on site, modeling use of KWLs to analyze data and report to staff. Consultants provide orientation to the school improvement process for new Title I administrators and building principals at a group meeting in the late summer and ongoing networking through meeting/distance learning two additional times during the year (December; April). Videotapes of the distance learning seminars conducted with model sites for the school improvement planning schools will also be made available to the implementing schools/districts administrators. Consultants will also coordinate technical assistance with the state's education accountability for schools in accreditation year and CSRD alignment, so the respective school plans for 2002-2003 meet school improvement, PL 221, Reading First, and CSRD requirements.

#### Statewide Support System for Title I Year 3-5 Implementing Schools

This school support system provides services to schools in Year 3, 4 and 5 Implementing. These schools were involved in the School Support System for Indiana during their planning and implementing years. The sustaining year support further refines school improvement processes, reallocation of resources and organizational frameworks to support sustainability. That is, schools have developed the capacity to support continuous, ongoing school improvement. Consultants will conduct two site technical assistance visits for Year 3 Implementing schools and Year 4 and 5 Implementing schools may use Title I funds or other funds for site technical assistance visits. All schools receive full-day technical assistance visits.

*On-site technical assistance visits* are made to Year 3 Implementing schools. For all on-site technical assistance visits, consultants assist teams in auditing SWP implementation monitoring process: 1) reviewing and revising data collection, summarization, and analysis practices and 2) setting/strengthening benchmarks. Consultants facilitate checkpoints and staff meetings on site, modeling use of KWLs to analyze data and report to staff. Consultants provide orientation to SWP for new Title I administrators and building principals at a group meeting in the late summer and ongoing networking through meeting/distance learning two additional times during the year (December; April). Videotapes of the distance learning seminars conducted with model sites for the school improvement planning schools will be made available to the implementing schools/districts administrators. Consultants will also coordinate technical assistance with the state's education accountability for schools in accreditation year and CSRD alignment, so the respective school plans for 2002-2003 meet both school improvement, PL 221, state education accountability, Reading First, and CSRD requirements.

#### **b. Ensure that all teachers, particularly those in high-poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified.**

The State of Indiana has already embarked on a number of efforts that are intended to ensure that all teachers, particularly in high poverty and low performing schools are highly qualified. They include state legislated programs, policies of the Indiana State Board of Education, Indiana Professional Standards Board and the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, and leadership from the state professional organizations.

Project SET (Student Exploratory Teaching) is, according to the language in its appropriation bill, “designed to encourage exceptional secondary and post-secondary students to enter the teaching profession. Particular emphasis is placed on the recruitment of minorities, males, and physically handicapped students (although not to the exclusion of other students).” While the state has supported this initiative to recruit minorities since the mid-eighties, there has been little need for recruitment in general. Indiana has not yet experienced the acute teacher shortage that has been the case in many other states.

The Minority Teacher Scholarship was created by the 1988 Indiana General Assembly to address the shortage of Black and Hispanic teachers in Indiana. The law has been amended to include the fields of special education, occupational therapy and physical therapy. More information on this recruitment effort is available at the State Student Assistance Commission of Indiana website <<http://www.in.gov/ssaci/programs/m-teach.html>>.

Legislation in the 2001 session of the General Assembly created the transition to teaching as an alternate route to teacher licensure. The Professional Standards Board currently is in the rulemaking process and the teacher training institutions are establishing programs. Consult the Professional Standards Board website <<http://www.state.in.us/psb/>> for a copy of the proposed rule.

The State received funding from the Transition to Teaching Program, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title II, Part C, Chapter B, in October 2001. Indiana’s Transition to Teaching Program addresses the shortage of qualified teachers in special education, mathematics, and science. Four school districts, all urban centers, where the problem is most acute—Indianapolis Public Schools, Ft. Wayne Community Schools, Gary Community Schools, South Bend Community School Corporation—participate in the federally funded program. The grant proposal was a collaborative effort of the Indiana Department of Education and the Commission for Higher Education. Candidates in the first cohort have been recruited, selected and will begin their programs in September.

The Beginning Teacher Internship Program, an effort to address the quality of teaching in general and retention specifically, became law with the passage of the A+ Program in the mid-eighties. The program has evolved into a very robust effort for first year teachers. Consult the website <<http://www.in.gov/psb/internship/>> for a complete description.

The Indiana Principal Leadership Academy (IPLA), created in the mid-eighties, is institutionalized as the training program for school principals in the state. The curriculum evolves but it is always designed to accommodate the needs of adult learners. The cohort groups meet periodically over a two-year period. “Graduates” of the IPLA continue their professional development with an active alumni organization. Consult the website for information <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/ipla/welcome.html>>.

The state's accountability legislation, Public Law 221, gives high priority to teacher quality with its requirement for a professional development plan to support the school improvement efforts. If teachers are to be successful they must have opportunities to develop their skills and stay abreast of content knowledge. The legislature affirmed this with its appropriation for professional development in the 2001 session. The plans are due at the Indiana Department of Education on June 30, 2002 with State funding to be distributed after July 1.

Indiana has supported a robust program of professional development in technology for teachers and administrators since 1983 when the first state funds for instructional technology were appropriated. It is commendable that Indiana lawmakers' first technology money went not for hardware, but for people. These programs have been designed so that they are "about learning, not technology" and have evolved with the changes in schools and in the industry. Currently a major effort, *INDIANANext*, is providing training in leadership and technology for public and private school principals and superintendents. As you can see on the website <<http://www.indiananext.org/>> this is next generation professional development.

In 2001 the Indiana General Assembly, for the first time, appropriated funds to support participation in the *National Board Certification* program. Educate Indiana, funded by Goals 2000, Title III, had provided initial support for teachers who were engaged in the process.

The above sample activities illustrate the State of Indiana's commitment to maintaining only qualified teachers for its elementary and secondary students. The *No Child Left Behind* Act affords an opportunity for the State to be more deliberate in ensuring that this goal is met. The State will utilize the US Department of Education Title II Guidance, the findings of our earlier initiatives, and the prevailing research in developing a broad based plan. This effort will require the collaboration of many but especially the teacher licensing agency, the Education Roundtable, and the state boards and commissions that have responsibility for K-12 education. Data are being compiled to identify the scope of the problem and, along with the latest research, will serve as the basis for the work.

Indiana's teachers who are not fully licensed in the area in which they are teaching has not been serious in teaching areas other than Special Education. According to Professional Standards Board figures for the Limited Licenses in school year 1999-2000, the top ten areas are:

	Number Limited Licenses Issued
Seriously Emotionally Handicapped	434
Mild Disabilities	251
Learning Disabled	183
Severe Disabilities	156
Mildly Mentally Handicapped	125
Mathematics	60

General Elementary	40
English	32
Spanish	27
Physically Handicapped	17

These licenses were issued in schools for an array of reasons but it is clear that high poverty urban centers have the most compelling numbers. The ten school districts requesting highest numbers of limited licenses are:

Gary Community Schools	105
Indianapolis Public Schools	102
South Bend Community Schools	77
Ft. Wayne Community Schools	52
Northwest Special Education Cooperative	41
School City of Mishawaka	30
School City of Hammond	27
Richmond Community Schools	24
Anderson Community School Corp.	20
Carmel Clay Schools	20
Kokomo-Center Township Consolidated Schools	20

This pool of school districts represents a place to start as the State assumes its leadership role in ensuring that qualified teachers are in our schools. This may be accomplished by helping the school districts put in place recruitment packages. Indiana has had very little experience with developing and offering incentive packages in recent years because, frankly, there has not been the need. Indiana trained teachers have taken advantage of such packages in other states. None of the previous Class Size Reduction program funds were used for recruitment incentives. Technical assistance for school districts that choose to develop such plans can be provided through funds from this Act. The State will identify individuals who have executed recruitment incentive programs in other locations and have them introduce the concepts to Indiana districts. The districts with the most acute problems receive large allocations from Titles I and II. State leadership will be necessary to assist the districts in effectively coordinating these funds.

Indiana is not different than other states in the area of retention. “Teaching is an occupation that loses many of its newly trained practitioners very early in their careers. ...Over the five year period, the cumulative losses of beginning teachers from the school district that hired them was about 45 percent, consisting of 16 percent who moved to different districts and 28 percent who left teaching altogether. The percentage leaving teaching in Indiana is consistent with previous national and regional findings.” This was taken from a February 2002 study, *Teacher Turnover In Indiana: Who Stays, Leaves, and Moves?* by Neil D. Theobald and Robert S. Michael. This issue will be the object of much attention of the Title II state funds. The Commission for Higher Education and the Indiana Department of Education administered funds will address this issue.

“Indiana Promise,” an initiative to improve administrative practice in Indiana schools, is supported by a grant from the *Leaders Count*, a project that subgrants monies from



Wallace-Readers Digest funds. Four policy leaders—Governor Frank O'Bannon, Senator Teresa Lubbers, Representative Greg Porter, State Board Member Daniel Tanoos—join the Chief State School Officer and others who represent state education associations, higher education and professional development agencies, business and school leaders as Indiana's consortium. Studies have been commissioned to gather data regarding the state of the principal and the state of the superintendent. The findings of these studies will guide the policy work of the consortium and can also guide the uses of Title II leadership funds,

Policy implications for the following six areas serve as the focus and mission of "Indiana Promise" work:

- Setting a state priority for action to strengthen school leadership
- Expanding the candidate pool
- Education and professional learning
- Licensure, certification, and program accreditation
- Conditions of professional practice
- Authority for practice and governance structures.

Indiana will rely heavily on the findings of the three studies that are being completed during this calendar year for information to guide the use of its Title II funding.

Within the Indiana Department of Education, Title I and Title II programs will be coordinated to serve the high need school districts in the critical areas of teacher and administrator quality. Assurances that are a part of the state's Title I application and the Title II applications affirm the goal of maintaining only highly qualified, appropriately licensed teachers. In technical assistance opportunities, both Title I and Title II staff will stress the flexibility provided by this Act, especially the "Transferability" provisions.

Indiana's Reading First application, submitted on June 11, includes a provision so that as early as three years from now there will be 100 newly licensed Reading Specialists. It proposed to pay \$325 (a little more than ½ tuition costs) per course taken in the Reading Specialists endorsement program. This is one of several strategic professional development efforts focused on the quality of K-3 educators, especially in scientifically based reading instruction. Attention will be given to coordinating Reading First professional development funds with other federal funds when appropriate.

The Indiana Department of Education will be unequivocal in its expectations for no excuses when it comes to providing qualified teachers for all children. The Department, through its accreditation and statewide school support systems, will monitor individual schools to identify any areas of concern. This oversight has been accomplished in the past by cooperating with Indiana Professional Standards Board, using data sources from the schools, and the Teacher License Data Base. Communication and coordination of the agencies with responsibility for teacher quality is the key to meeting these imperatives.

- c. Ensure that all paraprofessionals (excluding those working with parents or as translators) attain the qualifications stated in sections 1119(c) and (d) by the 2005-2006 school year.**

After collaboration with the Indiana Professional Standards Board (certification of teachers), the Department identified and disseminated to districts the criteria for meeting paraprofessional requirements under section 1119(c) and (d).

*1119 (c) NEW PARAPROFESSIONALS ---*

*(1) In general requires LEAs to ensure that all paraprofessionals hired after the date of enactment of NCLB and working in a program supported with Title I funds shall have:*

- (A) completed at least 2 years of study at an institution of higher education;*
- (B) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or*
- (C) met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment –*
  - (i) knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics; or*
  - (ii) knowledge of, and the ability to assist in reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness, as appropriate.*

*(2) The receipt of a secondary school diploma (or its recognized equivalent) shall be necessary but not sufficient to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (1)(C) (emphasis added).*

*1119 (d) EXISTING PARAPROFESSIONALS — requires LEAs to ensure that all paraprofessionals hired before the date of enactment of NCLB and working in a program supported by Title I funds satisfy the requirements of subsection (c) within 4 years after the date of enactment.*

The SEA will use the Praxis I as the assessment measure for paraprofessionals to satisfy the requirements under 1119(c)(1)(A), (B), and part of (C). Currently, all Indiana teacher education programs require this pre-professional test at the end of a student's sophomore year (equivalent to meeting the requirements under section 1119 (A) and (B)). This is a test of a student's competency in reading, writing, and basic arithmetic.

In the absence of a standardized assessment specifically-designed for paraprofessionals and that satisfies *all* of the requirements under (C)(i) and (ii), Indiana will use Praxis I with the understanding that paraprofessionals must: 1) receive ongoing, high quality professional development aligned to the school's goals and key strategies; and 2) participate in professional development activities specific to individual needs in the area of instruction. Furthermore, paraprofessionals will be directly supervised by a certified, highly qualified teacher when providing instruction to targeted children.

The SEA and Indiana Professional Standards Board will continue to review this assessment requirement and other standardized assessments for paraprofessionals. Using what we learn from CSR and Reading First evaluation and monitoring, the SEA will disseminate information and provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding knowledge

and skill development for paraprofessionals that is aligned with the school's professional development plan and focused on scientific based research strategies.

Wherever feasible, education service centers and universities will help support the efforts of the Department in their work with districts/local educational agencies to ensure a seamless, coordinated effort to provide intervention and build capacity in schools for providing instruction from the most qualified staff, and especially those in high poverty areas and those schools in need of improvement.

The State will coordinate technical assistance with Indiana public and private universities, education service centers, regional networking groups, and the Title I Advisory Committee to ensure that activities under section 1119 are carried out and that:

- paraprofessionals with instructional duties that are hired by LEAs after January 8, 2002 to work in a program supported with Title I funds have 1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; 2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or 3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through the State's requirement for a "rigorous" test of competency;
- all existing paraprofessionals with instructional duties working in a program supported with Title I funds meet these requirements within four years; and
- all paraprofessionals (regardless of their hiring date) in a program supported with Title I funds have a secondary school diploma or equivalent.

The State's *2002-2003 Title I Application for Grant* will include assurances that superintendents, principals and Title I program administrators understand and meet the requirements for paraprofessionals providing instruction to the neediest students.

**d. Help LEAs with a high need for technology, high percentages or numbers of children in poverty, and low-performing schools to form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), libraries, and other private and public profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction.**

- The *Indiana Web Academy* (<<http://www.indianawebacademy.org>>), funded through the Department of Education, provides the following parent and school community partnerships:
  - B** works with Indiana school communities, at no cost to the school, to train educators, students and parents on how to develop an effective website. These websites are designed for the purpose of better communication between the school and the school community;
  - B** conducts Internet training for parents and school community members through seminars available on-site at the school to better understand the role of the Internet in education; and
  - B** provides access to K-12 teachers and parents to purchase discounted computer systems through partnerships with technology vendors.
- Indiana is working in partnership with experts at the national level, state and not-for-profit agencies and school level personnel on development of a print publication with

- an accompanying dynamic website that examines the correlation between student achievement and library media and technology programs. Copies of the publications and workshops for educators that provide information and strategies on improving student achievement through the use of library media and technology programs will be conducted at technology and library media conferences and at regional meetings throughout the state.
- The Department conducts regional *technology and library media workshops* throughout the state, that are available to all educators. The workshop topics are determined by the group stakeholders and include school, district, and service center personnel as well as invited vendors and other agencies that serve the needs of the group participants. These workshops include a forum for participants to request assistance or guidance from other participants.
  - The Department encourages schools to establish and support learning partnerships between classroom teachers, parents and early literacy community support systems such as libraries and facilitates networking opportunities for these partnerships. LEAs are encouraged to collaborate with Institutions of Higher Education and other professional development associations. The opportunities are presented to educators at workshops. The Department regularly collaborates with the State Library, the Commission on Higher Education, and other public and private agencies in developing educational programs that address teaching and learning with technology.

**e. Promote parental and community participation in schools**

Parent involvement/family partnership components of Titles I, II, IV, V, VI-B, Homeless, and IDEA-B (special education parent mentors) and Early Childhood Special Education are being addressed. LEAs will set aside funds required under NCLB for parent involvement and each funded program under ESEA will address strategies to implement parent involvement programs as required under the Act.

Eight regional administrative spring workshops were conducted in February and March 2002, and a statewide meeting in May 2002 in collaboration with the Indiana Superintendents Association; Indiana Principals Association; Indiana School Board Association; and the Indiana Department of Education to inform corporation administrators and teachers (superintendents; Title I program administrators; and other staff) of the requirements under section 1116 for:

1. Schools not demonstrating AYP for 2 consecutive years or more
2. School choice options for parents whose child attends a Title I school identified for school improvement
3. Supplemental instructional service options for children who attend a school not demonstrating AYP for 3 or more consecutive years
4. Setting aside a portion of the corporation's allocation for transportation and supplemental instructional services (included in the *2002-2003 Title I Application for Grant*).

School Choice. A new web-based information site for parents and others (under development) will allow anyone to access FAQ's (Frequently Asked Questions) about school choice under section 1116. The list of schools identified for school improvement and their different levels or years of improvement will be available on the State's web site. Annual administrative workshops and multiple regional networking meetings will be conducted to keep corporations informed of guidelines and procedures related to school choice and its implementation so that notice and timely information can be provided parents.

Supplemental Services. The Title I Advisory Committee will meet (June 18, 2002) to review the implementation of supplemental instructional services under section 1116. This advisory group will provide feedback on a proposed RFP and rating instrument rubric for reviewing potential supplemental service providers.

In collaboration with Department staff, the Indiana Education Roundtable and the Title I Advisory Committee, the SEA will finalize a request for proposal (RFP) for the Supplemental Instructional Services state list. The RFP will focus on selecting high quality, research based designs that can provide supplemental instructional services to eligible students. The RFP will be presented for discussion and recommendation for approval to the Education Roundtable and the State Board of Education.

Following approval of the release of the RFP, the SEA will provide a broad distribution of the RFP. Copies will be sent to all LEAs, education service centers, and Indiana's public and private postsecondary institutions. In addition, a public notice will be given through multiple media sources.

The State's list of providers will be available for school year 2002-2003. A web-based information site for parents and others (under development) will allow anyone to access FAQ's (Frequently Asked Questions) about supplemental instructional services under section 1116. Annual administrative workshops and multiple regional networking meetings will be conducted to keep corporations informed of guidelines and procedures related to school choice and its implementation so that notice and timely information can be provided parents.

In addition, the State will coordinate technical assistance with the Indiana Center for Family, School and Community Partnerships, education service centers, regional networking groups, and the Title I Advisory Committee to ensure that activities under section 1118 are carried out regarding:

- the school-parent compact;
- school choice and supplemental services provisions;
- individual and school report card provisions;
- collecting and disseminating effective parental involvement practices to LEAs and schools;
- disseminate and publicize results of the SEA's review required by section 1111(b)(2) to LEAs, teachers and other staff, parents, students, and the community;

- parents right-to-know provisions in the language that parents understand; and
- identifying and compiling the list of supplemental instructional services.

A stronger effort is being made to provide parents with up-to-date information regarding their child's learning and opportunities for parents to be more involved in making informed decisions in the educational process. Examples of such efforts follow:

- *Parental Notification Requirements* in NCLB are being addressed regarding teacher qualifications, English language learners, and schools in school improvement or corrective action status. All parent notification requirements are addressed in program applications and will be posted on Indiana's new NCLB website (under development).
- A sample *Title III Parental Notification* of student placement in a language instruction educational program is available in English and Spanish on the Department's web site at <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/lmmp/parentalnotificationltr.html>>.
- Under Public Law 100, Indiana's 2001 General Assembly extended, for the first time, more choices for Indiana families by giving *charter school* granting authority to local school corporations, the Mayor of Indianapolis, and state universities. To date, 13 operators have been granted charters, and 11 charter schools are scheduled to open in fall 2002.

The Department will make available and disseminate resources for parents, including scientifically-based reading research information. Materials on the U.S. Department of Education's web site, and Indiana-developed, parent-friendly materials will be centrally located on Indiana's NCLB website-- Parents' Link. Examples include:

- Put Reading First: Helping Your Child Learn to Read, *A Parent Guide* for Preschool Through Grade 3 at <[http://www.nifl/research/reading\\_first2.html](http://www.nifl/research/reading_first2.html)>.
- *Guide For Parents: How Do I Know a Good Early Reading Program When I See One?* at <<http://www.ed.gov/inits/rrl/guide.html>>.
- *The Parent's Tool Box* (<<http://www.nochildleftbehind.gov/parents/>>) designed to give parents useful information to assist their child with learning. The U.S. Department of Education's Partnership for Family Involvement in Education prepared *A Homework Tips for Parents/Consejos Para los padres sobre La tarea Escolar*.<sup>®</sup> This English/Spanish resource provides general homework tips and specific reading and math homework tips.
- *School-Parent-Community Partnerships Resource Book* provides models of parental participation in schools. National studies, multiple states' policies, and best practices at the local level are featured at <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/publications/schoomcompartner.html>>.
- *What you and your child should know about Indiana's Graduation Qualifying Exam* explains the purpose and specific details about Indiana GQE examinations for Indiana sophomores (Grade 10). It also provides sample English/language arts and mathematics questions, discusses scoring procedures and testing opportunities, and answers questions most frequently asked by parents. The document is available at <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/publications/gradexam00.html>>.

- What are Indiana's Academic Standards? This new web site allows anyone to access Indiana's academic standards by content area, by grade level, and even by specific standard. The color-coded system is easy to use and may be accessed at <<http://doe.state.in.us/asap/standards/englishlanguagearts/enla.html>>.
- *The Indiana Web Academy* at ><http://www.indianawebacademy.org>> funded through the Department of Education, provides the following parent and school community partnerships:
  - B works with Indiana school communities, at no cost to the school, to train educators, students and parents on how to develop an effective website. These websites are designed for the purpose of better communication between the school and the school community;
  - B conducts Internet training for parents and school community members through seminars available on-site at the school to better understand the role of the Internet in education; and
  - B provides access to K-12 teachers and parents to purchase discounted computer systems through partnerships with technology vendors.
- Research-based materials and the resources of the *Indiana Center for School and Community Partnerships* are used to partner with parental involvement initiatives.
- Indiana's *Even Start Family Literacy* programs work closely with school districts and communities in partnership to help students reach high standards, help build school readiness in young children, help parents learn, and to be involved in breaking the cycle of poverty and low literacy.
- The Department will coordinate resources to administer and support *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers* as a new state grant program. Parental involvement will be a priority of the state's program.
- Migratory students achieve through the *Title I, Part C, Migrant Education* program while getting parents and families involved in their schools and communities.

**f. Secure baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system described in Part I.**

Indiana has conducted and will conduct the following activities to secure the baseline and follow-up data that will be needed for future reporting:

Indiana's Student Test Number (STN) system, based on XML technology, will be operational for the 2002-2003 school year. The system will allow the state to determine the percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup including limited English proficient students, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts and mathematics. The data system will allow the state to determine if schools have made AYP. Mobility data also will be captured. The STN system includes a student look-up data base to help ensure that students who transfer are not ~~Al~~lost.@

Teacher qualifications have been a part of the school accreditation process for a number of years. Schools annually report names and license numbers of their teachers. This allows verification of credentials against the teacher license database.

Schools report disciplinary actions based on possession of firearms or other deadly weapons. The Indiana Department of Education is working with criminal justice agencies to secure data on students who are victims of violent crimes (already defined by the state).

The STN system will allow for more precise reporting of dropout and graduation rates.

**6. Describe coordination with Governor's office, State-level activities, organizations, agencies, and other Federal programs.**

**a. SEA officials and staff consulted with the Governor's office in the development of the State plan.**

The academic standards, assessments, and accountability system included in Indiana's plan, as described in Part II, 1 of this application, were developed in consultation with the Governor's office and other organizations, including Indiana's *Education Roundtable*. Appointed and co-chaired by Governor Frank O'Bannon and Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Suellen Reed, Indiana's *Education Roundtable* serves to improve education for Hoosier students. Composed of equal representation from business/community and education, and additional representatives from the Indiana General Assembly, members are appointed for their commitment to improving the state of education in Indiana and as leaders in their respective fields.

Meeting on an informal basis in 1998, members began to focus on critical issues in improving education in Indiana. Formalized through legislation in 1999, now codified at IC 20-1-20.5-1 *et seq.*, the *Education Roundtable* was charged with making recommendations concerning education to the Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction, General Assembly, and the Indiana State Board of Education. The Roundtable was given additional responsibilities now set forth in IC 20-10.2, which include assuming the duties formerly held by the State Standards Task Force.

In addition to the expertise of its members, the Roundtable has enlisted the help of nationally-renowned experts in an effort to reach the most informed decisions and recommendations. The Roundtable also has actively sought the thoughts and opinions of parents and communities throughout the state. Roundtable meetings are open to the public and additional input is encouraged via the Public Comment section on its website: <http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us>.

Charged with an aggressive agenda, the group's immediate focus is recommending improvements to the State Board of Education concerning Indiana's academic standards, assessment, and accountability system. At the June 4, 2002 meeting, its most recent resolutions included:

- Adopting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Goals and Indicators;



- Serving as the Reading Leadership Team for Indiana's Reading First Program.

Both of the adopted resolutions are at <<http://www.edroundtable.state.in.us/resolution.htm>>

The Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities section of the consolidated plan was developed as a coordinated effort with the Governor's designated agency, the *Division of Mental Health and Addiction*. Once developed, the comprehensive plan for the use of the funds by the Indiana Department of Education and the Division of Mental Health and Addiction to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities was reviewed and approved by the Director of the Division of Mental Health and Addiction and by the Governor's Executive Assistant.

**b. State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-Funded programs with State-level activities the State administers.**

The Indiana Department of Education's Office of Student Services manages the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) program and the Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy, described in Part II, 3 of the consolidated plan. This arrangement allows the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Consultant, the Safe Schools Consultant and the Director of the Indiana School Safety Specialist Academy to coordinate prevention and intervention activities to address school safety. This coordination occurs through frequent meetings and cross participation on the Indiana Safe Schools Advisory Council and the Indiana Safe and Drug-Free Schools Advisory Council. This recurrent interaction ensures that the needs of schools related to safety are addressed and that duplication of effort is avoided.

In Indiana, the state-level agencies--including the Indiana Department of Education--involved in youth drug and violence prevention in schools and communities have been working collaboratively to address these issues. The collaboration has taken place within the context of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program and across other State and Federally funded prevention efforts. The Indiana Department of Education will continue its participation on the Interagency Council and the Governor's Advisory Panel for Grassroots Prevention Coalitions Initiative. The Interagency Council was established by Indiana statute to coordinate the activities of State agencies, commissions, and boards that approve, plan and fund drug education, prevention, treatment, and justice programs. The Governor's Advisory Panel was established to develop a strategic prevention plan on behalf of the Governor's Office. The membership of the panel includes regional and grassroots representatives, the Department of Education, the Indiana State Department of Health, the Governor's Commission for a Drug-Free Indiana and the Division of Mental Health and Addiction. This plan will enhance the prevention system in Indiana by increasing collaboration and coordination of prevention strategies, programs and policies among state agencies.

From a leadership perspective, the Indiana Department of Education has established and will maintain its State-level SDFSC Advisory Council. This council was convened in March of 2001 by Indiana Department of Education to acquire input from the stakeholders in the State on the direction of efforts related to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program. The membership of the council includes LEA-level Safe and Drug-Free Schools coordinators, representatives of the State agencies involved with drug and violence prevention, a parent representative, a student representative and a representative from a community-based organization.

**c. State officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, and nonprofit organizations.**

*Indiana's Grade 1 and Grade 2 Reading Assessments*, developed in collaboration with Indiana University's Center for Innovation in Assessment, are distributed to all Indiana elementary schools. These informal assessments are designed to help first and second grade teachers identify skill needs related to 1) phonemic awareness, 2) recognition of letters, beginning and ending sounds, 3) word, sentence, and paragraph comprehension, and 4) story comprehension. These assessments are administered by classroom teachers throughout the school year and are aligned to the Indiana English/Language Arts Standards. In addition, these assessments are benchmarked to the reading and writing section of the Grade 3 ISTEP+ thus offering teachers instructional information related to potential ISTEP+ achievement. The Indiana Kindergarten Pre-reading/Reading Assessment will be developed by the Center for Innovation in Assessment and piloted in schools during the 2003-2004 school year.

As one of the fifteen recipients of the *State Action for Education Leadership (SAELP)* grant, Indiana was awarded a Wallace Readers' Digest year-three implementation grant to address the issues of attracting, supporting, and sustaining educational leaders within the state. To facilitate this project, The Indiana Promise Consortium was formed, comprised of state officials, educational and business leaders, and other organizational leaders.

By using multiple strategies, such as: convening focus groups; using list serve forums to conduct strategy surveys; and holding hearings for public intent on proposed strategies, the Indiana Promise Consortium will review state action in the following categories to enact new state legislative and/or administrative policies to improve the practice of principals and superintendents:

- setting a state priority for action to strengthen school leadership;
- expanding the candidate pool;
- education and professional learning;
- licensure, certification and program accreditation;
- conditions of professional practice;
- authority for practice and governance structures.

The data collected by the Consortium will direct proposed policy changes related to professional development, recruitment, and retention of quality educational leaders at four demonstration sites, one of which will be the recipient of the *LEADERS Count* funds.

The Department through the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program has coordinated with other organizations by funding and participating in activities such as *Project Peace* and the *Indiana Teen Institute*.

Project PEACE is a peer mediation training program implemented by the Indiana Department of Education with support from the Indiana State Bar Association and the Indiana Attorney General's Office. This public-private partnership introduces dispute resolution techniques to elementary and middle school students throughout Indiana. *Project PEACE* strives to reduce conflicts and violence in schools by teaching children how to discuss and mediate their disagreements. The objective of *Project PEACE* is to neutralize minor conflicts before they become explosive confrontations which often lead to violent acts. Children become active participants in controlling behavior in their schools by taking the role of mediator. More information on *Project PEACE* is available at <<http://www.doe.state.in.us/sservices/peace/welcome.html>>.

The Indiana Teen Institute is a team focused leadership training program. The team is sponsored by their school and consists of four youth and one adult who attend a summer residential program. The program teaches communication and cooperation through adventure learning and a combination of workshops and general sessions. During the program the team develops a plan to address student drug use behavior in their school, the team then implements that plan during the next school year. The Indiana Department of Education is a major financial supporter of the Indiana Teen Institute and Office of Student Services staff members have served on the organization's advisory board. To access the *Indiana Teen Institute* web site go to <<http://www.prevention.indiana.edu/ITI/>>.

The Indiana Department of Education also has partnered with the *Indiana Center for Family, School and Community Partnerships*. This not-for-profit organization, partially funded by the U.S. Department of Education, focuses on improving student achievement through parent involvement and developing parent partnerships between schools and communities. The Indiana Department of Education has provided funding for the Partnership Center to implement two Parent Summits which will allow parents to gain knowledge of how and what they can do to create safer school environments. The funding will also support the enhancement of Parent Centers statewide. These Parent Centers are designed and designated as safe places for parents to participate in the daily life of the school. Funding from the Department will assist in the development of a Parent Conflict Management Pilot Project in an urban school of Indianapolis Public Schools. The pilot projects goal is the development of a model program for that will give parents the attitudes, skills, and support to deal with conflicts positively, both at school and at home.

State superintendent, Dr. Suellen Reed, serves as a member of the *State Human Resource Investment Council* (HRIC), which has representation from a variety of state agencies, businesses, union, and higher education. The HRIC deals with a variety of workforce and economic issues.

Indiana has worked hard to provide our students, teachers, parents, and administrators with tools that promote parental involvement in education and increase the effective use of technology in our classroom. The Center for Digital Government praised Indiana for its use of Web-based technology in education with a first-place *Best of Breed* award for e-education tools. Three *Indiana Web Academy* programs, E-Parent, E-Locker and E-Store open new avenues of communication for more than 8,000 users of E-Parent and over 4,500 E-Locker accounts in the state. A big part of the success of Indiana Web Academy comes from the use of certified teachers to train educators on-site in the use of these programs and in the integration of technology in their classrooms. In 2001, the Indiana Web Academy trained more than 6,500 teachers across the state. The Indiana Web Academy is a joint program of the Indiana Department of Education and the Intelnet Commission.

**d. State officials and staff will coordinate with other agencies, including the Governor's office, and with other Federal programs.**

Indiana will create a state-level partnership to coordinate activities related to development of subsequent sub missions and implementation of *No Child Left Behind*.

The partnership will include:

- Department of Education
- Office of the Governor
- Commission on Higher Education
- Family and Social Services Administration
- Department of Workforce Development
- Criminal Justice Institute
- Professional Standards Board

Purdue University, the Indiana Department of Education, the Indiana Department of Workforce Development, the Southern Region Education Board, and the State Regional Tech Prep Specialists have formed a collaborative partnership to promote and implement a statewide engineering and engineering technology initiative. *Project Lead the Way* (PLTW) is a high school pre-engineering and engineering technology program, as well as a middle school *Gateway to Technology* program.

The collaboration is governed by a steering committee with representatives of the SEA and Purdue University serving as co-chairs. Committee members include: representatives from the IDOE and Purdue University, teachers, counselors, administrators, school board members, parents, representatives of business and industry, and other state agencies.

PLTW is a prescribed Grades 6-12 program with potential articulation to postsecondary programs in engineering and engineering technology. It is scoped and sequenced from middle school through high school and is fully-integrated into the required State curriculum and academic standards. The purpose of the middle school curriculum is to expose students to a broad overview of the field of technology and its related processes through project-based instruction. The high school pre-engineering curriculum is a four-year sequence of courses which, when combined with college preparatory mathematics and science courses in high school, introduces students to the scope, rigor, and discipline of the engineering field prior to entering higher education. Designed for all students, the courses address national standards in mathematics, science, and technology.

PLTW provides an intensive, comprehensive training program for teachers who receive special training in technology that is part of the student curriculum. The training model consists of four parts: pre-assessment, a Summer Training Institute, ongoing training and continuous support, and training and support for school counselors. By 2005, the partnership anticipates having 500 PLTW teachers in 40 percent of Indiana high schools.

The *Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition* administered by IDOE has representation from Adult Education and Family Literacy Act programs, Even Start programs, higher education, Head Start program, Title I and other K-12 programs, departments of workforce development, commerce, and family and social services, as well as community-based and faith-based organizations, and others. The Coalition promotes collaboration and coordination among agencies that deal with the full range of literacy issues from early childhood through the adult workforce, including English literacy.

Adult education and Even Start are represented on the *Indiana Family and Social Services Families and Fathers Work Group*.

**7. Describe the strategies the state will use to determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, school, and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting State and local goals and desired program outcomes.**

The Department routinely collects data to measure the progress of Indiana schools. Systems are in place for collection and the analysis of statewide, district, and school-level ISTEP+ assessment data. School report cards are required by the state accountability requirements under PL 221 and will be aligned to ensure that reporting requirements under NCLB are included. Reports will be available to the public and posted on the Department's website. All ESEA covered programs complete annual participation and evaluation reports and data required by the U.S. Department of Education will be submitted by our Department.

Data will be used for identifying exemplary performance, schools and districts identified for school improvement, corrective action or restructuring. Analysis of the data will enable the Department to identify statewide priorities, prioritize school and district technical assistance needs, identify districts for on-site monitoring, provide incentive awards, and determine

program effectiveness and decisions made in determining continuation of competitive subgrant awards.

As the Department establishes a process for providing assistance to low-performing schools, it will be important that we gather ideas from educators and other customers. In order to accomplish this, targeted focus groups will be convened to assist in these efforts. Group participants will represent: practicing superintendents, principals, and teachers (elementary, middle, and high school); local school board members, and local community members who are not educators. Based on information from this input, a strawman will be developed and shared for comments from the group and with broader audiences for public comment.

Refinements will be made based on this input. Possible topics may include:

- Who might provide assistance B what process will be used to identify practitioners and other providers of assistance; how will Aexpert teams be organized and trained; what will be the specific responsibilities of the team members, the IDOE, the local school/district; and how can schools establish critical-friend relationships with other high-performing schools.
- What types of assistance might be provided B directive or facilitative, given the identified needs of the schools; A best case scenario would provide assistance to help develop local capacities rather than providing only direct guidance. Topics may include: data-driven decision-making; connecting standards/instruction/assessment/technology as a learning tool (for all learners both adults and students); developing leadership skills among administrators, teachers, and students; engaging parents and other community members in the educational programs of the school; meaningful professional development that supports continuous improvement of education and students' performance.
- How does the assistance complement/extend the school improvement plan B in order to support the development of local capacities, assistance should support and extend the local school improvement plan to the extent possible. Assistance, however, must discourage local schools from seeking the A silver bullet, assistance must encourage commitment to and earnest efforts to make real changes in educational programming.

## **Part III. ESEA Key Programmatic Requirements and Fiscal Information**

### **1. Title I, Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs**

- a. Identify the amount of the reservation in section 1003(a) for school improvement that the State will use for State-level activities and describe those activities.

The Indiana Department of Education will reserve two percent of its allocation under subpart 2 of Part A for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and four percent of its allocation for fiscal years 2004 through 2007, to carry out the state's responsibilities under sections 1116 and 1117, including carrying out Indiana's statewide system of technical assistance and support for local school districts.

- b. For the 95 percent of the reservation in section 1003(a) that must be made available to LEAs, describe how the SEA will allocate funds to assist LEAs in complying with the school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring requirements of section 1116 and identify any SEA requirements for use of those funds.

Ninety-five percent of the reserved amount will be made available to schools as grants to implement scientifically based research reform models. Schools will select from a menu of options based on the needs of students that are not meeting the state's performance standard. Grants will range in amounts comparable to the cost of implementing the SBR strategies. Districts will be expected to review school improvement plans and conduct meaningful discussions about how to leverage all funding available to the school.

95 percent of funds will be made available to LEAs/schools to select a comprehensive school design/improvement initiative. Funding amounts will depend on availability of funds and LEA requests. Priority will be given to highest poverty and lowest achieving schools.

The Indiana Department of Education will identify schools through its accountability system including the annual Title I Report of Adequate Yearly Progress to determine priority schools. Schools will be ranked with the lowest percent of students attaining proficiency and the number of years in "school improvement". Highest priority will be given to schools in three or more years of not demonstrating adequate yearly progress. Districts with schools that have not already affiliated with the statewide system of support for continuous school improvement or have adopted another comprehensive school reform model (e.g., CSRD) will be targeted to receive assistance services first.

Schools that show consistent and exemplary increases in student achievement will be eligible for incentives and rewards that are required in Indiana's P.L.221 Accountability for Schools and the NCLB Act. As indicated earlier, the Indiana's Education Round Table and the Indiana State Board of Education will meet during the coming year to resolve the difference in both laws. Once all issues have been resolved, a single system

of incentives and rewards will be available to all schools that consistently meet or exceed achievement targets.

Corrective actions will be determined by the Indiana State Board of Education with recommendations from the Governor's Education Round Table.

- c. Identify what part, if any, of State administrative funds the SEA will use for assessment development under section 1004 of the ESEA, and describe how those funds will be used.

The State is reviewing the status of the assessment system. A needs assessment will be done based on the results of Fall 2002 ISTEP+ testing and decisions will be forthcoming in revisions of this consolidated Application by May 2003.

- d. Describe the State's procedure for distributing funds for schools to use for supplemental services under section 1116(e)(7), and identify the amount of funds those schools will receive.

The State is reviewing the status of the supplemental instructional services. A needs assessment will be done based on the results of Fall 2002 ISTEP+ testing and decisions will be forthcoming in revisions of this consolidated Application by May 2003.

- e. Describe how the State will use funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111(b)(1).

The State is reviewing the status of the assessment system. A needs assessment will be done based on the results of Fall 2002 ISTEP+ testing and decisions will be forthcoming in revisions of this consolidated Application by May 2003.

## **2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3—Even Start Family Literacy**

- a. The SEA uses its performance indicators to monitor and evaluate Even Start programs to promote program improvement. Local programs must develop goals for learner outcomes that are consistent with or exceed the state indicators. In the application local programs are required to establish internal evaluation strategies and employ an external evaluator to provide rigorous and objective evaluation of progress toward the local program's stated goals. The evaluation process is designed to measure the ability of Even Start programs to reach high standards and to assist the programs in implementing continuous improvement at all levels.

Programs that do not meet the state's performance indicators at the end of the program year participate in a review process. The process involves: (1) a more in-depth self-evaluation, (2) an on-site monitoring visit, and (3) targeted technical assistance and professional development opportunities. Programs are required to submit local improvement plans that address the areas of deficiency. The state coordinator and the



program's evaluator contact the program staff on a regular basis to check on progress and provide technical assistance.

The following year progress toward the state benchmarks must be documented for 100 percent of the performance indicators for continued federal funding. A program that has not met 100 percent of the performance measures will be notified that it will not be funded and informed of the right to a hearing to appeal the decision.

- b. Indiana Even Start programs will use the following Performance Indicators for Program Year 2002-2003 to guide their interim and end-of year evaluation reporting that reflects program efforts toward the stated evaluation requirements.

**Early Childhood Performance Indicators:**

75 percent or more of Even Start pre-school age children will demonstrate improved readiness for school reading and academic success in (1) language and literacy, (2) numeracy and concept development, and (3) socialization and inter-personal skills as measured by one of the following:

- a one level increase on the COR (1) Language and Literacy section, (2) Logic and Mathematics section, and (3) Social Relations section (optional: may also include Initiative section); or
- a one level increase on the Work Sampling System (1) literacy section, (2) mathematics-related section, and (3) social-skills related section; or
- age-appropriate development (within 10 percent of chronological age) on the LAP-R/ELAP (1) Language and Pre-writing sections, (2) Cognitive section, and (3) Personal-Social section (optional: include Self-Help section)

**School-Age Children Performance Indicator:**

At least 90 percent of Even Start school-age children will...

- maintain at least a 95 percent school attendance rate;
- demonstrate grade-level reading and math achievement by scoring at or above standards on the ISTEP+ English/language arts and math state assessment; and
- make continuous progress through Grade three without being retained in grade.

**ABE/ASE/GED Adult Education Performance Indicators:**

After a minimum of 50 hours of instruction, adult learners will be assessed in the areas of reading, writing and math (numeracy and problem-solving). A percentage of adult learners at specified levels will complete that level and advance to the next category/level as follows:

- 20 percent of Beginning Literacy ABE advance to Beginning Basic ABE;
- 28 percent of Beginning Basic ABE advance to Low Intermediate ABE;
- 30 percent of Low Intermediate ABE advance to High Intermediate ABE;
- 30 percent of High Intermediate ABE advance to Low Adult Secondary Education;
- 34 percent of Low Adult Secondary Education advance to High Adult

- Secondary Education; and
- 35 percent of High Adult Secondary Education earn a GED or high school diploma.

English as a Second Language Acquisition Performance Indicators:

After a minimum of 50 hours of instruction, English as a Second Language adult learners will be assessed for English language competency. A percentage of adult learners at specified levels will complete that level and advance to the next category/level as follows:

- 23 percent of Beginning Literacy ESL advance to Beginning Basic ESL;
- 27 percent of Beginning Basic ESL advance to Low Intermediate ESL;
- 28 percent of Low Intermediate ESL advance to High Intermediate ESL;
- 28 percent of High Intermediate ESL advance to Low Advanced ESL;
- 30 percent of Low Advanced ESL advance to High Advanced ESL; and
- 30 percent of High Advanced ESL earn a GED or high school diploma.

Adult Employability Performance Indicators:

Even Start parents enrolled in the ABE/GED and secondary high school programs will increase employability skills as demonstrated by:

- 80 percent who have computer skills as a goal will demonstrate at least a one-level increase on the Computer Skills Competency Checklist; and/or
- 80 percent will document improved employment-related attitude, behaviors and skills as documented on the Employment-related Attitude/Behavior Appraisal or Transferable Employability Skills Checklist.

Other Adult Learner Performance Indicators:

- 20 percent of adult learners with the goal of advanced education or training will enroll in post-secondary education, job training/retraining program and/or military service.
- 20 percent of adults not employed at enrollment will obtain unsubsidized employment.
- 34 percent of adults with a high school completion goal will earn a high school diploma or GED.

Teen Parent Performance Indicators:

Of teen parents participating in a secondary school program:

- 65 percent pass the ISTEP+ GQE in both English/language arts and math and/or receive a waiver in those areas;
- 75 percent who retest on the ISTEP+ GQE have increased scores compared to their previous GQE scores;
- 80 percent will accumulate required Core 40 high school credits at a rate to ensure on-time graduation; and
- 80 percent with G. 12 status in the fall of the year will earn a high school diploma during the school year.

Performance Indicator of Impact on Families:

Parenting Involvement in Home and School Performance Indicators:

- 80 percent of Even Start parents enrolled for at least six months will demonstrate involvement in their children's development through participation in 80 percent or more of the scheduled parent-teacher conferences and home visits, as documented by school and program records.
- A program's Even Start parents attain two or more of the following:
  - 75 percent extend literacy and learning activities into the home through reading, homework support and/or interactive learning activities an average of four times weekly, as documented by program records such as monthly family calendars or reading logs;
  - 80 percent participate in a minimum of six family activities such as going to the library or field trips with a learning focus, as documented by program records such as attendance logs or monthly family calendars; or
  - 75 percent engage in language-rich parent-child interactions and hold age-appropriate expectations of their children's development, as documented by more desirable or appropriate responses to at least half of the specified items on Form E ESPIRS.

Performance Indicators of Program Effort and Quality:

PACT Performance Indicator:

At least 10 parent-child interactive literacy activities are incorporated monthly.

Parent Support/Training Performance Indicator:

At least 2 parent support or training activities per month provide parents information regarding how to support their children's age-appropriate development and learning.

Participation Performance Indicator:

A minimum of 15 families ( 12 hours) enrolled per site per quarter.

Participation Performance Indicator (*ABE/GED programs*):

- 40 percent of enrolled families for a minimum of 12 months (minimum attendance = 75 percent for parent and child)
- 40 percent of enrolled families for a minimum of 6 months (minimum attendance = 75 percent for parent and child)
- 10 percent of enrolled families for a minimum of 3 months (minimum attendance = 75 percent for parent and child)

Participation Performance Indicator (*Teen Parent Programs*):

- 10 percent of enrolled families for a minimum of 12 months (minimum attendance = 75 percent for parent and child)
- 45 percent of enrolled families for a minimum of 6 months (minimum attendance = 75 percent for parent and child)
- 35 percent of enrolled families for a minimum of 3 months (minimum attendance = 75 percent for parent and child)

**Summer Even Start Performance Indicators:**

- A minimum of 20 contact sessions were held with Even Start families during the summer, as documented by program records.
- At least 75 percent of the summer activities focus on adult education, early childhood education and/or parenting objectives, as documented by program records.

**Collaboration Performance Indicators:**

- The Even Start program holds coordination and advisory meetings with key collaborating programs at least four times during the program year, as documented by meeting attendance sheets and minutes.
  - The Even Start program has at least ten non-LEA collaborating agencies making in-kind contributions to the program during the program year, as documented by quarterly in-kind records. If the minimum of ten is not met, the program can demonstrate an increase of at least two non-LEA collaborating agencies over the previous year.
- c. The academic standards for pre-school children recently developed by the SAE will be distributed to all Even Start programs to serve as a guide for pre-school curricula. The standards are based on current research and knowledge of child development; age appropriate skills; and activities for teachers, parents, and children. The foundation skills have been developed for children aged three to five to introduce them to all content areas within the kindergarten curriculum so they will be prepared to accomplish the kindergarten state standards. State content and achievement standards for school-age children are distributed to Even Start programs. Related materials specifically developed for parents are reviewed with participant parents.
- d. The amount the state will reserve for administration from the allowable six percent under subsection 1233 (a) is approximately \$ 98,263 (2.9 percent). Administrative costs include the state coordinator's salary and travel, review committee expenses, and office support. Approximately \$102,275 (3.1 percent) will be reserved for technical assistance for program improvement. Technical assistance will include state external consultants' fees and travel expenses and professional development expenses for local Even Start program staff.

**3. Title I, Part C—Education of Migrant Children**

- a. The particular needs of migrant children are not always met by the regular system. The Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP) is designed to address these needs throughout the state by providing supplemental services that enhance continuity of instruction. The annual statewide needs assessment is multifaceted in design. Data collection is done via project Performance Reports and project site visitations. Each LEA that provides services to migrant children must submit a comprehensive Performance Report to the SEA within two weeks of the conclusion of the project. These reports include the following:

1. Student participation
  - by grade level
  - language proficiency
  - daily attendance
2. Special services—identification of special education needs
3. Procedures and methods to determine needs of migrant children
  - teacher referrals
  - criteria referenced tests
  - parent referrals
  - other agencies
4. Questions targeting factors that contribute to high/low student achievement
5. Support services
  - identification and recruitment
  - inservice / professional development
  - parental involvement
  - other agencies

Each Performance Report is analyzed and compiled to reflect the needs of the LEAs. Additionally, each project is visited at least once to allow opportunities to gather more data and validate reports. This information serves as a foundation for program planning.

- b. The procedures for prioritizing services to the migrant children in greatest need are as follows:
  1. In the spring, the Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP) conducts an annual Project Directors' Workshop that is attended by representatives from each prospective project school. The training that occurs emphasizes the importance of identifying the needs of eligible students. School personnel are clearly instructed that after students have been certified to be eligible for services that their level of need must be determined.
  2. The application that the local education agencies (LEAs) use to seek funding for migrant projects requires a demonstration of methods of determining student needs. For example, the following questions are a significant portion of the LEA application:
    - a. Describe the educational needs that have been identified for migrant children in your project.
    - b. How were these needs identified? (Especially in regard to the cultural and linguistic needs of the population served.)
    - c. Needs assessment information: describe the results of the most recent needs assessment information of the children served by your project and how this information will be used to improve the project.

- d. Attach copies of forms used for needs assessment.
  - e. Describe how you will ensure that no eligible migratory child will be prevented from benefiting fully from the project's services because he or she does not speak English or has limited English language skills.
3. Migrant students determined to be limited English proficient (LEP) are assessed through the use of the Language Assessment Scales or the Woodcock Munoz Language Assessment. Local education agencies (LEAs) are encouraged to maintain portfolios and content skills checklists as students demonstrate performance competence according to their English language or multiple intelligence abilities.
  4. There is a strong focus on dropout prevention through the encouragement of distance learning and semi-independent study courses to increase credit accrual for secondary students.
  5. During the project period each site is visited at least once, this provides an opportunity to verify procedures. Consequently, migrant students with the greatest needs are consistently a top service priority.
  6. Unique needs of students are encouraged to be integrated into the school improvement plans during site visits by program staff.
- c) After reviewing each LEA migrant education project application and determining that each section is accurate, thorough, and all required signatures are included, the budget is reviewed in the following manner:
1. The budget is checked for consistency with the narrative portions of the application. For example, if the narrative describes the use of a bilingual instructional assistant for K-3, then the personnel section of the budget should indicate a provision for such a staff person.
  2. For projects that have been funded previous years, those approved budgets are compared to the new budget being submitted. The end-of-the-year expenditure reports are also reviewed in order to determine actual amounts spent for each line item. For example, the new budget requests \$200.00 for travel for project staff to visit migrant camps. The previous year that same project was approved for \$150.00 for that line item, and the final expenditure report indicates that the actual amount spent was \$83.70. The amount approved would then be \$150.00 (same as previous year) or \$100.00 (if budget reductions are critical).
  3. Changes that may have occurred are always taken into consideration. For example, a significant increase in the student population may result in a need to increase the number of staff members, the amount of supplies, and even the number of trips that the staff members, both LEA and SEA, make to the migrant camps.
  4. For projects that indicate salary levels and/or fringe benefits that are significantly

- higher than the state average, justifications must be submitted prior to approval. The justifications can be a copy of the school corporation's salary scale, and/or a letter from the superintendent.
5. In order to approve the purchase of equipment (i.e., computers, printers, etc.) the project agrees to send serial numbers to this office, and understands that the equipment is the property of the Indiana Migrant Education Program. This is stated in the project approval letter.
  6. Budgets that need to be cut are discussed with the project director in order that (s)he can decide the best area(s) to trim. For example, if a budget needs to be cut by "x" number of dollars, or "x" percent, the project director is asked to examine the budget and decide how the budget can be trimmed with the least amount of loss to the project content. This allows the project director to have ownership in the budget, and removes the feeling of lack of control. This is a part of effective communication. Budget cuts are only done after a dialogue has taken place.
  7. If changes need to be made over the project period, a budget amendment sheet is to be completed by the project director and approved by the State Director. Budget amendments that require additional funds must be accompanied by a letter from the project director or superintendent that fully explains the need for additional funds. If the budget amendment merely requires moving funds from one line item to another, then a letter will only be required to accompany the budget amendment sheet if the budget change impacts the original design of the project.
- d. The Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP) works closely with agencies, both public and private, to provide the services that are needed by the migrant child. Participation and coordination of instructional and supportive activities with agencies and other organizations enables the special and unique needs of the migrant child to be met. A partial listing of these agencies follows:
1. Transition Resources Corporation (TRC)BWIA 167
  2. Family and Social Services Administration
  3. Indiana Department of Health
  4. Indiana Health Centers, Inc.
  5. Indiana Department of Workforce Development
  6. Indiana Rural Opportunities
  7. Legal Services Organization
  8. Texas Migrant Council

The Indiana Task Force on Migrant Affairs provides opportunities for continual open ongoing communication with other migrant agencies and programs. These agencies and organizations play an important part in meeting the instructional and supportive needs of the IMEP. Services that are provided include day care, Head Start, commodities and clothing distribution, food pantries, rural transportation, home weatherization, Women, Infant and Children (WIC), and Project Safe (energy assistance).

Interstate and intrastate coordination is an ongoing, year-round process which must take place in order to meet the educational needs of the migratory child. Intrastate coordination includes:

1. Participation in the Indiana Task Force on Migrant Affairs for purposes of information sharing and coordinating activities which will improve and enhance the lifestyle of migrant farm workers.
2. Sponsoring, planning and participating in the annual statewide Interagency Conference that includes service providers from all programs.
3. Joint projects with agencies:
  - a. Transition Resources Corporation (WIA 167)
    - Summer Enhancement for Secondary students
    - Adult Basic and pre-vocational training
    - Pesticide training
  - b. Indiana Health Centers, Inc. —providers of ambulatory health services for migrant children and their families.
  - c. Indiana Department of Family and Social Services
  - d. Indiana Department of Health Nurses Program—coordination of health services provided by county health departments.
4. The Consolidated Outreach Project (COP) Bin 1982 the Indiana Task Force on Migrant Affairs initiated steps to design, implement, and coordinate services in order to reduce duplication and expenditures to federal and state funded migrant programs. The resulting Consolidated Outreach Project is a centralized multi-agency funded statewide project that provides outreach, referral and follow up services for migrant and seasonal farm workers. This project has been recognized nationally as an effective model of coordination.

Interstate coordination is critical to meeting the needs of migrant children as they travel from state to state. Demonstrations of our commitment to interstate coordination include:

- a. Student information is maintained on the state COEStar data system. Student information is received from sending states, current data is entered, and information is transferred to the students next locale.
- b. The IMEP has direct access to the New Generations Systems (NGS) database containing educational and health information for children homebased in Texas.
- c. The IMEP participates in the Migrant Student Locator Database through WestED to access educational and health information for children homebased in California.
- d. Students Migrating Access Resources through Technology (SMART) is an interactive distance learning educational program based in Texas that is especially designed for children who are homebased in Texas.



- e. The IMEP exchanges information with Texas Migrant Council (TMC), migrant Head Start provider, both while the children are in Indiana and when they return to Texas.
  - f. TMC and IMEP conduct joint parent involvement meetings and workshops.
  - g. Consortium Arrangement for Identification and Recruitment (CAIR) is a consortium to maximize identification and recruitment practices, including contacting agri-businesses and conducting industrial surveys.
  - h. Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) are semi-independent study courses used by tutors and in classrooms for children homebased in Texas.
  - i. University of Texas (UT) are semi-independent study courses used by tutors and in classrooms for children homebased in Texas.
  - j. Migrant Education Comprehensive Consortium Arrangement (MECCA) includes out of state exit level Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) testing, SMART, The Red Bag Project (record transfer).
5. The determination of program effectiveness is an ongoing process that is constantly evolving. There are numerous check points throughout the year that play an integral role in the overall process.
- a. At the conclusion of each program year, SEA staff participate in a series of meetings to analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of each element of the program and design strategies for improvement.
  - b. An annual Project Directors' Workshop is conducted to provide the most current information, demonstrations of most effective practices, and assistance with the application process.
  - c. Each LEA submits an application for subgrant that includes a narrative describing the project design and methods of service delivery. Applications are reviewed by SEA staff and clarifications are made by contacting the LEA project directors. If any issues or concerns exist, those are addressed prior to the start of the project. Additionally, notations are made for the file for future reference and follow-up during site visits.
  - d. Each project is visited at least once per term. Prior to each site visit the LEA project director is sent written confirmation of the site visit and a project information sheet. The project director gathers all the requested information prior to the visit. At the conclusion of each visit, a verbal exit report allows for suggestions for improvement and commendations for effective practices. Finally, to confirm all that was discussed, a written site visit report or letter is sent to the project director and local superintendent.
  - e. During each LEA subgrantee site visit, all areas described in the application are thoroughly reviewed along with the information prepared in advance by the LEA project director. The ongoing communication between SEA and LEA contributes to the success of the program. Frequent telephone contact along with formal and informal site visits are great contributors to success.
  - f. At the conclusion of each project term, LEAs complete an End of the Project Performance Report. These reports are carefully reviewed and the information is analyzed to determine areas of success and areas needing improvement.

6. The administrative and program functions that are unique to the IMEP are performed by the SEA and are paid by the Title I, Part C allocation. These functions, as listed below, represent approximately 30 percent of the total allocation.
  - a. Statewide comprehensive identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children.
  - b. Operation of the statewide database system (COEStar).
  - c. Interstate and intrastate coordination of programs and projects.
  - d. Statewide tutorial project for students not served by migrant project site.
  - e. Coordination of programs and projects with public and private agencies.
  - f. Compile and process reports submitted by migrant projects.
  - g. Maintenance of inventories of equipment acquired with Title I, Part C Migrant Education funds.
  - h. Technical assistance and professional development for project personnel.
  - i. Monitor, review and evaluate activities of the IMEP.

The services provided by the IMEP are designed to meet the special unique needs of children of migratory workers. The funds are not used to substitute services which are available through other means. These funds are used to provide needed supplemental services only for eligible migratory children.

#### **4. Title I, Part D—Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk**

- a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic and vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program.

Program goals, performance indicators, objectives, and data sources will be provided by May 2003. The overall program goals focus on providing services for children and youth who have been placed in local and State institutions and programs for neglected or delinquent youth. The goals include the provision that services are supplemental to this at risk population to ensure that each student has the opportunity to meet the same challenging State academic content and achievement standards that all children in the state are expected to meet.

- b. Describe how the SEA is assisting projects funded under the program in facilitating the transition of youth from correctional facilities to locally operated programs.

State level services to institutions serving neglected, delinquent, or at-risk children and youth are under review by the IDOE. Traditionally, a primary goal is the successful transitioning of these youth from the institutional environment to the community for further schooling and/or employment. This includes facilitating the development of support systems to assist in the transition process.

The evaluation process will involve the statewide assessment system utilized for all students. Children and youth placed in neglected and delinquent institutions and programs are required to be involved in the same assessments that all children in the State are involved in.

- c. Describe how the funds reserved under section 1418 will be used for transition services for students leaving institutions for schools served by LEAs, or postsecondary institutions or vocational and technical training programs.

Individual children and youth who have been in a State-operated institution and are under the age of 20 may participate in a State Agency sponsored transition program or project. These opportunities will be made available by the State Agency directly or through an appropriate subcontractor. Transition assistance will be available to eligible students attending or re-entering schools served by local education agencies, or have received a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent. The child or youth who has obtained a high school diploma or its recognized equivalent may receive assistance in obtaining exposure and help from pre-placement programs, worksite schools, and essential supports of educational and/or financial counseling or placement services to ensure success in postsecondary education or vocational and technical training.

## **5. Title I, Part F—Comprehensive School Reform**

- a. Describe the process the State educational agency will use to ensure that programs funded include and integrate all eleven required components of a comprehensive school reform design.

The CSR Application/RFP Process (see Part II, 2; 2: State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs) requires the LEAs to integrate the eleven required components. To be selected, applicants must demonstrate that their district and school building level improvement planning processes have reached the stage at which existing resources are allocated to support strategies that are based on district and school needs. All applicants must provide assurance of technical support from providers of the scientifically research-based designs that they may have selected.

Only those LEAs who describe all eleven components will be selected for funding. The model below shows how the State integrates the eleven components for a comprehensive and cohesive proposal process. Components of this model or framework are used to align CSR, Reading First and Accountability grants so that resources and technical assistance using the State's system for continuous school improvement (see Part II, 4) serves as a foundation for providing timeliness and scope of assistance appropriate to LEA/school needs and levels of implementation.

### **I. Design a Comprehensive Program for Increasing Student Achievement**

- a. Ground the CSR program in a comprehensive needs assessment
  - Address the identified priority needs in the CSR program

- b. Identify the research/theory base of the CSR design
  - Identify the research-based principles that undergird the design
  - Cite references from current research/theory and/or provide evidence of program's/strategies' impact on student achievement
- c. Include components that align key strategies and instruction practice/approaches
  - Consider reading, writing, and math and/or interdisciplinary (must have 3 goals related to Indiana Academic Standards)
  - Align strategies with Indiana Academic Standards (curriculum-instruction-assessment alignment)
  - Utilize technology (as appropriate)
- d. Address classroom environment and school management strategies needed to support the instructional program.
- e. include all grade levels and all classrooms in the school's CSR program
- f. Provide a range of support services to ensure that all students learn

[I. Addresses required components 1 (effective, research-based methods and strategies) and 2 (comprehensive design with aligned components)]

## II. Provide Support for Teaching/Learning and Implementation of the Design

- a. Provide on-going professional development
  - Schedule adequate time through job-embedded professional development and options outside regular school day/year
  - Find time through a restructured school day/week/year, as necessary
- b. Provide whole staff professional development on priority focus/foci
  - Ensure adequate breadth and depth to support high quality implementation
  - Include additional and appropriate training options needed for individual and small groups
- c. Provide regularly scheduled, on-going collaboration
  - Collaborate for planning and problem-solving to support high quality instruction
  - Include all grade-levels, all teachers, all instructional assistants
- d. Include strategy/ies to support transfer to classroom practice (e.g., in-house facilitator, coaching models, instructional lead teacher/team leader, action research)
- e. Involve external technical assistance and support
  - Involve external technical assistance in assessment checkpoints and for implementation support as needed
  - Utilize an external technical assistance provider with the following characteristics: 1) a well informed understanding of school change; 2) knowledgeable about the school's CSR design, e.g., research-based practices, standards-based education, strategies to support curriculum-instruction-assessment alignment based on Indiana Academic Standards and ISTEP+; 3) adequate expertise in facilitating the organization and analysis of CSR assessment and supportive in identifying needed refinements; and 4) a supportive "critical friend" who shares feedback with the school staff

[Addresses required components 3 (professional development) and 7 (external technical support and assistance)].

### III. Evaluate and Refine the Design Through On-going Accountability

- a. Evaluate the impact on student learning
  - Set measurable goals for student performance on ISTEP+ *Proficiency Performance Summary*: 1) set benchmarks for meeting those goals; and 2) do subgroup analysis to monitor performance of all students.
  - Gather performance assessment results related to Indiana Academic Standards for all grade level.
  - Gather and review data from the *Annual Performance Report* (the “School Report Card”)
- b. Assess implementation to identify refinements and needed support
  - For each goal (minimum of 3), assess the consistency and quality of implementation within: 1) key strategies; 2) professional development; 3) family and community involvement; and 4) technology (where appropriate)
  - Monitor progress on the school’s CSR design using the school’s implementation profile (one for each goal) from the CSR proposal
  - Check for the transfer of professional development to classroom practice
- c. Include a schedule of checkpoints when summarized data will be reviewed by all staff
- d. Use of technology to make assessment procedures efficient

[Addresses required component 4 (measurable goals and benchmarks) and 8 (evaluation strategies)]

### IV. Provide Internal and External Support for the CSR Design

- a. Emphasize school leadership
  - Principal leadership: specify activities that support CSR implementation on a daily, weekly, and/or monthly basis
  - Staff leadership: use participatory decision-making approaches emphasizing communication and problem-solving
- b. Provide structural and logistical support to the school (examples include schedule changes, contract waivers with the teachers’ union, and changes in “traditional” school routines)
- c. Support staff, family and community ownership of CSR program
  - Use a planning process that builds consensus for the CSR design
  - Use participatory decision-making strategies to support problem-solving and implementation
- d. Nurture strong family and community involvement through clear communication and activities that promote
  - “parents in the school” involvement, including parent education and training
  - “parents at home” involvement (parental support for learning at home)

- active involvement of business and community in the school
- e. Demonstrate district support for the school's CSR program
  - Align school CSR program with district vision/mission and/or strategic plan
  - Identify a central office liaison for the school's CSR program
  - Ensure central office support for CSR activities, e.g., facilitate paperwork, help remove barriers
- f. Describe the transition strategies to ensure continuity with feeder and receiving schools
  - Identify major curricular and instructional expectations that clarify what students are expected to know and be able to do at each level when schooling transitions (elementary-to-middle school; middle school-to-high school)
  - Describe any other efforts that support successful student transition among schools
- g. Utilize all available funding sources to pay for CSR components; plan for sustainability
  - Project major budget expenses for Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3; then demonstrate sustainability in Year 4 when CSR funds are no longer available

[Addresses required component 5 (support within the school), 6 (parental and community involvement) and 9 (coordination of resources)]

- h. Describe the percentage of schools that participate in the Comprehensive School Reform program (CSR) meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics.

School achievement data will be in the State Consolidated Performance Report for CSR schools.

## **6. Title II, Part A—Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund**

1. The State Education Agency has not identified additional performance targets and indicators under section 1119(a)(2) for this submission. As other objectives are adopted and needs are identified, they will be incorporated into the state's May 2003 Consolidated Application.
2. The Indiana Department of Education will hold LEAs accountable for meeting their annual measurable objectives described in Section 1119(a)(2) of the Act so that the state meets its goal by the 2005-2006 school year. The "out of field" teaching data are being secured from the Indiana Professional Standards Board so that the SEA may verify and work with information supplied by the local school districts throughout the life of this plan. The state agency will provide the U. S. Department of Education Guidance when it becomes available and will then provide technical assistance regarding "qualified teacher" definition and ensure that the LEAs know the potential of the part in allowing them to address any deficit.

Indiana will implement Title II, Part A in a seamless way with the state's accountability program, enacted with the passage of the state's Public Law 221-1999. The law established a system for school planning, improvement, goal setting, accreditation, and accountability. It requires public schools and accredited private schools to submit a School Improvement Plan by June 30, 2002. After data-derived goals are established for each school, the plan requires inclusion of a professional development component. This component addresses how teaching staff will gain knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes needed to improve instruction to meet achievement goals. The legislation requires that instructional needs of all students (disaggregated by subgroup) be attended to in the execution of the plans.

The Indiana State Board of Education has adopted principles of effective professional development that are consistent with research as well as the "professional development" definition in Act, section 9101(34). The professional development component of the school improvement plan is based on a template that reflects these principles, the school's vision and goals, the role of technology and other approaches they will use to address the goals. The schools have been provided a description of how to evaluate whether or not research is legitimate and scientific. A copy of the template "Professional Development Program Design" is attached to this preliminary consolidated application (Appendix C). The plans must be submitted to the Indiana Department of Education by June 30, 2002 for approval. These plans will serve as the basis for local education agency participation in Title II, Part A. The Title II, Part A application will be constructed so that it builds on the work that has already been completed. Technical assistance will be offered on a continuous basis to ensure programs offered are consistent with the requirements of the state legislation and the new federal law.

3. The Indiana Commission for Higher Education and the Indiana Department of Education agreed to the following allotment of Title II, Part A funds:

Commission for Higher Education Administration	\$ 60,810 *
Commission for Higher Education Grants	\$1,171,209
Indiana Department of Education State Leadership	\$1,171,209 **
Indiana Department of Education LEA Grants	\$44,505,929
Indiana Department of Education Administration	\$412, 405 *

\* One percent of total

\*\* The State is awaiting U.S. Department of Education guidance before collaborators finalize the activities for which financial support will be allocated.

## **7. Title II, Part D—Enhancing Education Through Technology**

An allocation of 50 percent of Indiana's EETT targeted to LEA is determined using current Title I formulas for disbursement. Formula funds will be awarded to all LEAs who will receive a Title I Part A allocation in 2002-03, including new eligible charter schools, and have an updated technology plan submitted and approved by the Indiana Department of Education. Formula funded schools will describe how EETT funds will be utilized to target

student achievement of the Indiana Academic Standards in low-income and low-performing schools in their school system.

In awarding competitive grants, Indiana will give priority to applicants with the highest needs that are committed to implementing a high-quality, research-based program(s) with effective practices that improve student academic achievement. LEA will be encouraged to form partnerships with LEAs, educational service centers, libraries and other agencies with technology expertise. To determine eligible LEAs for competitive grants, the SEA has created a Technology Need Index that include the following criteria:

- Number and percentage of students in poverty;
- Number and percentage of students scoring below grade level in reading/language arts and mathematics on the ISTEP+ test;
- Number and percentage of students for whom English is a second language; and
- Ratio of Assessed Valuation per student.

LEAs among the highest poverty districts in the state or any LEA identified as in need of improvement under Section 1116 of Title I, Part A (information will be provided by the Division of Federal Programs); will be pre-qualified to be eligible for the competitive funds.

A statewide grant announcement letter and application will be mailed to each school corporation superintendent, the Educational Service Centers, and will be available of the Indiana No Child Left Behind website. Applications will be disseminated to eligible school corporations through comprehensive print distribution systems and will be available electronically on the Indiana Department of education website at <http://www.doe.state.in.us>. The SEA through regional consultation and electronic bulletin boards will provide technical assistance, during the application period.

The timeline for the grant process is as follows:

- The request for proposals (RFP) will be developed in August 2002
- The RFP will be distributed in October 2002;
- Technical assistance workshops will be available in November 2002;
- Proposals will be due in January 2003;
  - Peer review of proposals conducted;
  - Final review completed;
  - Recommendations for funding prepared;
- LEAs will be notified in March 2003.

Competitive grant applications received by the SEA, are reviewed and scored by a committee composed of technology coordinators, curriculum and professional development specialists, SEA staff, teachers, and administrators. The scoring rubric assures that only those proposals with strong possibility of success will be awarded a competitive grant. During the grant period, constant technical assistance and oversight will be provided through structured training provided by the SEA.

In the competitive grant proposal LEAs will be asked to:



- Target specific academic needs as determined by student performance on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress–Plus (ISTEP+);
- Identify and set areas for student performance improvement based on school improvement plan goals;
- Discuss the provisions that will be made to ensure collaboration between teachers, parents, students, and community members for improved teaching and learning through technology;
- Explain how EETT funds will be utilized to target student achievement of the Indiana Academic Standards in low-income and low-performing schools in their school system; and;
- Describe how EETT funds will be coordinated with other funding sources.

Competitive grant funding amounts will vary and take into consideration the need of the LEA, the number of students and teachers being served and the scope of the project. The Department will provide a two-year award to grant recipients. Funding will be dispersed over the duration of the grant period. The longer length of the grant period will allow LEAs sufficient time to implement their project's goals and document their success. This longer time span will facilitate the ability to conduct meaningful scientifically-based research. LEA will have the time to gather and analyze longitudinal data that supports students achievement. LEA will be required to submit midterm assessment and evaluation reports documenting their evidence of increase student achievement as a result of this technology funding.

The Indiana DOE will ensure access by developing Internet resources for the state K-12 students and currently accessible by all LEAs in Indiana. The Indiana Department of Education will continue to collect and disaggregate data on technology access, use and professional development activity, by school size, location, demographic, income level, and performance record. This data will be further analyzed data to determine areas in need of greater need for technology access and professional development activities to better use technology to support student achievement. The Department will support LEA in acquiring funds through grant-writing and financial planning workshops.

## **8. Title III, Part A—English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement**

- a. SEA will ensure that LEAs use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing LEAs flexibility (to the extent permitted under State law) to select and implement such activities in a manner that each grantee determines best reflects local needs and circumstances.
  1. SEA will advise LEAs as to the options of language instruction educational programs that are scientifically based.
  2. In their local plans, LEAs will identify and summarize which scientifically based method will be implemented in their language instruction educational program. Plans will be reviewed and monitored by SEA staff to ensure appropriate programs.
  3. LEAs will have the flexibility to implement various methods of instruction and activities provided that they are scientifically based.

- b. SEA will hold LEAs accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for LEP children and making AYP that raises the achievement of LEP children through a variety of methods. A process for accountability related to these issues has been developed and includes:
  - 1. Local plans submitted by LEAs will describe how achievement objectives and AYP will be met and provide assurances to this end.
  - 2. Randomly selected LEAs will receive site visitations by SEA staff in conjunction with other programs including Title I, Part C, Migrant Education for program evaluation.
  - 3. The SEA will be available for technical assistance and troubleshooting to ensure that achievement objectives and AYP will be met by LEAs through a variety of networks including the ESL Taskforce.
  - 4. Annual Performance reports will be completed by all LEA sub-grantees and reviewed by SEA staff to ensure that achievement objectives and AYP have been met.
- c. The SEA will reserve 5 percent of its total allocation for State activities. Those activities will include professional development, planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination, technical assistance. The percentage of these reserved funds that the State will use for each of these activities will be determined by January 2003.
- d. As indicated under section 3114 (d)(1), the SEA will reserve not more than 15 percent of the allocation to LEAs experiencing a significant increase, as compared to the preceding two years, in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.
- e. The process for making sub-grants under section 3114 (d) to LEAs experiencing a significant increase in immigrant children and youth has been developed by the SEA. An annual count of immigrant children and youth is conducted and compiled each February by the SEA. This count is compared to data from the previous two years to determine which LEAs have experienced a significant increase in percentage or number of immigrant students. LEAs determined to meet this percentage or number increase will submit a local plan to the SEA which will be reviewed to ensure that a scientifically based language educational program has been proposed prior to sub-grant allocation.

The process for making formula sub-grants to LEAs based on the number of LEP students has also been developed. In keeping with section 3114 (b), no LEA will receive an allocation of less than \$10,000. The SEA has established that LEAs with a minimum of 50 LEP students would be eligible to receive \$200 per LEP student to meet the \$10,000 allocation minimum. The SEA has identified LEAs meeting this eligibility based on the Department of Education-Language Minority (DOE-LM) student data from school year 2000-01. Those districts not meeting the minimum number of LEP students to receive an allocation have the option of forming a consortia with other districts to meet the minimum requirement. Title III Informational Workshops were conducted by the SEA in May 2002 throughout the state to provide technical assistance to LEAs. An application format for the local plan is being developed by the SEA for LEAs to complete

and use to apply for funds. Local plans will be reviewed, approved, and monitored by SEA staff to ensure appropriate programs are in place. LEAs will have the flexibility to implement various methods of instruction and activities provided that they are scientifically based. SEA staff will also ensure that LEAs utilize Title III funds as a supplemental funding source. The SEA will continue to be available for technical assistance, professional development and evaluation of LEA programs.

The SEA has developed the following preliminary timeline for the process of LEA plan/application development, plan approval, LEA allocations and LEA program evaluations. Both immigrant and LEP formula grants will follow this timeline and process:

- June 2002 - Submission of State Consolidated Application  
Development of application format LEA local plan
  - July 2002 - Local plan available to LEAs via download from SEA  
website or hard copy mailing
  - September 2002 - Local plans due to SEA for review and approval
  - October 2002 - LEAs receive first half of allocation
  - program evaluation is on-going and continuous through technical assistance in addition to an annual LEA performance report.
- f. The number of K-12 limited English proficient (LEP) students in the state of Indiana for school year 2000-01 was 17,194.
- g. The number of immigrant children and youth in the state of Indiana as of the February 2002 count is 9,757.

## **9. Title IV, Part A—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities**

The following are the key strategies in Indiana's plan for the use of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program funds. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration's Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA) support the following activities to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities.

- Training and technical assistance to support the efforts of LEAs to implement the requirements of Title IV, Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities with special emphasis on the Principles of Effectiveness. Trainings will be conducted on a regional basis to increase access and will be conducted with the support of Region VII Comprehensive Center. The Indiana Department of Education will continue to develop its SDFSC web site to provide quick and easy access to technical assistance.
- The Indiana Department of Education and the Indiana Division of Mental Health and Addiction will provide funding to LEAs and CBOs that supports programs that effectively address the needs of the youth served by those organizations. This funding may include competitive grants for prevention efforts between school systems, Local Coordinating Councils, and CBOs.

- The IDOE and the DMHA will collaborate to offer professional development opportunities for community and school staff related to drug and violence prevention. These opportunities will be provided through conferences, workshops, and distance education. The focus of professional development efforts will be to support the use of science-based research programs and best practices in prevention programming. Efforts will also be made to build the capacity of schools and communities to work collaboratively toward common drug and violence prevention goals.

### **Uniform Management Information and Reporting System**

- The Indiana Department of Education will use current reporting systems to gather data on truancy rates and violence and drug related suspensions and expulsions. This data is reported to IDOE on a school-by-school basis.
- UMIRS requirements related to the types of curricula, programs, and services provided by LEAs; the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth in schools and communities; and to further diagnose the violence and drug related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions the Indiana Department of education will contract with the Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC). The IPRC at Indiana University, established in 1987, is a statewide clearinghouse for prevention technical assistance and information about alcohol, tobacco and other drugs for the State of Indiana.
- Through the IPRC, curricula, program and drug and violence incidence data will be collected through a system that will utilize the LEA level SDFSC coordinator. To collect LEA data IDOE staff will work with IPRC staff to develop a reporting tool with input from LEA level representatives through the Indiana SDFSC Advisory Council. IPRC will generate a report for the Indiana Department of Education. State level data on types of curricula, programs, and services provided by the SEA and Chief Executive Officer and other recipients of funds will be collected internally at the state level and will be included with the LEA level report.
- Data on the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth in schools and communities will be collected and reported through the current system that has been developed and implemented by the IPRC. The Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use Survey by Indiana Children and Adolescents has been conducted for the past twelve years. The survey is available annually on a voluntary basis to all schools in Indiana at no cost to the school system. The school district receives a report that can be used locally to assess needs and evaluate program success. The data is then compiled on a statewide basis and a report is made available to the public in a printed version and through the Internet.

### **UMIRS Tentative Implementation Schedule**

July 2002	Preliminary development of reporting tool and system in collaboration with the IPRC
August 2002	Preliminary reporting system will be reviewed and critiqued by the Indiana SDFSC Advisory Council

September 2002	School systems will be informed of reporting requirements through superintendents and the SDFSC coordinators
May 2003	The reporting form will be sent out to all LEA level SDFSC coordinators
September 1, 2003	The LEA level report will be due to the IPRC
November 1, 2003	The IPRC will provide the Indiana Department of Education with a state-level report

**10. Title IV, Part A, Subpart I, Section 4112(a)—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor**

**a. Governor’s Reservation**

The Governor reserves 20 percent.

**b. Governor’s Designee**

Bureau of Mental Health Promotion and Addiction Prevention  
Division of Mental Health and Addiction  
Family and Social Services Administration  
402 W. Washington W353  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2739

Contact: Sally Shearer Fleck, Bureau Chief  
Phone (317) 232-7880

**11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Section 4126—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants**

The Indiana Department of Education will research community service programs to identify the types of programs that are currently being used both within Indiana and nationally with a focus on programs designed for expelled or suspended students. Once this program review has been completed, the Department will pursue the development of partnerships between LEAs and community-based organizations that can provide community service programs to expelled and suspended youth. These partnerships will focus efforts in areas with greatest needs and with the potential for greatest impact. Funds will be provided on a contractual basis to an organization in the community that can facilitate access to community service opportunities and to an LEA that can identify students who fit program guidelines and facilitate their participation. The Department will also pursue the further development/expansion of community service programs for suspended and expelled students currently operating in Indiana schools.

**12. Title IV, Part B—21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers**

As required by the US Department of Education, the Department will collect baseline data and submit the information to the Federal agency in September 2003.

**ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATION**

## **21<sup>ST</sup> Century Community Learning Centers Program**

Indiana will:

- Write the application in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials, including the Chief State school officer, and other State agencies administering before and after school programs, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations.
- Award subgrants of not less than three years and not more than five years that are of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support high quality, effective programs.
- Fund entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families, and the families of such students.
- Require local applicants to submit a plan describing how community learning centers to be funded through this grant will continue after the grant period.
- Require local applicants to describe in their applications how the transportation needs of participating students will be addressed.

### **13. Title V, Part A—Innovative Programs**

- a. In accordance with section 5112(a)(1) of the ESEA, provide the SEA's formula for distributing program funds to LEAs. Include information on how the SEA will adjust its formula to provide higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child, such as -
  - i Children living in areas with concentrations of economically disadvantaged families;
  - ii Children from economically disadvantaged families; and
  - iii Children living in sparsely populated areas.

In compliance with section 5112 (a)(1), the department will distribute the Title V allocation to LEAs for fiscal year 2002 using the formula described below. If, in subsequent years, the state's Title V allocation increases, the department will distribute 100 percent of the increased funds to LEAs via this formula.

SA	State Allotment for local distribution (85 percent of Indiana's total allotment for Title V)
E	Total state enrollments from public and private nonprofit schools. (Information comes from Fall enrollments.)
EF	Enrollment Factor (Dollar amount when 80 percent SA/E)

LE Local enrollment of an Indiana school corporation and private nonprofit schools within the boundaries of the school corporation.

FLS Free and Reduced Lunch Students - Total number of students receiving free or reduced price lunches in the state.

PF Poverty Factor - Dollar amount when 20 percent SA/FLS

FL Total number of students receiving free or reduced price lunches in a school corporation.

LA Local allocation for distribution of Title V to a given school corporation.

$$LA = (EF \times LE) + (FL \times PF)$$

The department has adjusted the formula to provide higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest number or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child by allocating 20 percent of the amount available based on the percentage of free and reduced lunch students each LEA has.

- b. Indicate amount or percentage the State will reserve for each State-level activity under section 5121, and describe the activity.

%	Activity	Amount
2.25%	<b>State Administration</b>	\$178,914
	Activities will include the allocation of funds to LEAs, monitoring and evaluating the programs funded, and planning, supervising, and processing SEA funds	
3.75%	<b>Statewide education reform, school improvement programs and technical assistance and direct grants to LEAs, which assist such agencies under section 5131</b>	\$298,191
	Activities funded will support the “No Child Left Behind” legislation, and the implementation of our State accountability legislation, Public Law 221.	
6%	<b>Support for implementation of challenging State and local academic standards</b>	\$477,105

%	Activity	Amount
	Activities will include the development and refinement of standards, and professional development for improvement of instruction in teaching to Indiana's Academic Standards and Curriculum Frameworks.	
3%	<b>Support for arrangements that provide for independent</b> Activities will include the dissemination of the "School Report Card." Funds will also be used to support the ASAP Education Website, the computer-generated database known by the acronym that stands for "Accountability System for Academic Progress.	\$238,552
15%	<b>Total State Level Activities</b>	

#### 14. Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, section 6111—State Assessments Formula Grants

Describe how the State plans to use formula funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111(1) and (2).

The funds would be used to support all phases of test development, piloting, scoring and reporting for the additional required reading/language arts, mathematics (Grades 4, 5, and 7) and science tests at the grade levels required by NCLB that are currently not tested.

Funds would also be used to provide a common measure of English proficiency to all school in Indiana.

Some of any remaining funds would be spent to develop the additional data structures and collection and reporting mechanisms needed to support NCLB.

#### 15. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2—Rural and Low-Income School Program

- a. Identify the SEA's specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student academic achievement; decreasing student dropout rates; or improvement in other educational factors the SEA may elect to measure, and describe how Rural and Low-Income School program funds will help the SEA meet the goals and objectives identified.

Eleven school corporations have been identified as eligible for the Rural and Low-Income School Program for 2002. The SEA will adopt Performance Goal 1 for these



districts, as well as two other goals which are both specific and measurable. The three goals are:

- Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- Goal 2: Student dropout rates will decrease by 1/2 percent during the life of this program.
- Goal 3: Each school district participating in the Rural and Low-Income School Program will execute a professional development plan that provides scientifically based professional development for all of its instructional staff.

Using funds reserved for State use, the SEA will assign a staff person (0.25 FTE) to be an advocate for the school districts participating in this program.

- b. The Indiana Department of Education will award the funds under the Rural and Low-Income School Program by formula proportionate to the number of students in eligible districts:

SA State allotment for local distribution (95 percent of Indiana's total allotment for Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2

TE Total enrollment of qualifying school corporations

LE Local enrollment of a qualifying school corporation

LA Local allocation for distribution of Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 to a given school corporation

$$LA = LE/TE \times SA$$

## **State Educational Agency**

### **1. GEPA 427**

In accordance with the provisions of GEPA, Section 427, enacted as part of Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, the Indiana Department of Education examined six types of barriers (gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age) that can impede equitable access or participation in the benefits derived from programs supported by funds reserved for state activities. Indiana is unequivocal in its commitment to erasing all barriers to participation in this program and to building safeguards in every phase of the program's implementation.

In addition to the barriers identified in GEPA, the Indiana Department of Education has identified poverty as a potential barrier to children and families receiving maximum benefit of the programs supported by state level monies. The rate of poverty for school age children in Indiana rose from 11.9 percent in 1979 to 19 percent in the 1990's. Indiana's professional development plan for teachers includes programming and training on sensitivity to characteristics of children in situational or generational poverty.

There are an estimated 27,000 homeless children in Indiana in both urban and rural areas of the state. There are few resources to mitigate their plight but every effort to ensure that homeless young children will receive any benefit that is available for other children.

An increasing number of English language learners in Indiana, again in both rural and urban areas, represent a critical area of concern for the staff of the agency. Family literacy efforts give special attention in areas where there are large numbers of non-English speaking children.

### **2. Consolidated Administrated Funds**

The Indiana Department of Education currently has no plans for consolidating the federal administrative funds.

### **3. Transferability**

While the Department appreciates the flexibility provided to transfer funds under sections 6121-6123 of the NCLB Act, Indiana does not plan to transfer funds at this time. We do, however, reserve the right to do so in the future and will notify the U.S. Department of Education at least 30 days prior to the effective transfer as required by statute.

## **4. Assurances**

### **a. General and Cross-Cutting Assurances**

Through the general assurances and assurance (1) in section 9304 (a), the Indiana Department of Education agrees to comply with all statutory requirements as they relate to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and all applicable program statutes and maintain records of compliance with each program.

1. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications;
2. The control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or an Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and
3. The public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or Indian tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law;
4. The State will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including—
  - a. The enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program;
  - b. The correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation; and
  - c. The adoption of written procedures for the receipt and resolution of complaints alleging violations of law in the administration of the programs;
5. The State will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Secretary or other Federal officials;
6. The State will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under each such program;
7. The State will—
  - a. Make reports to the Secretary as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to perform the Secretary's duties under each such program; and
  - b. Maintain such records, provide such information to the Secretary, and afford such access to the records as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties; and
  - c. Before the plan or application was submitted to the Secretary, the State afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the plan or application and considered such comment.

**b. Certification of Compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements****Unsafe School Choice Option Policy Certification**

The Indiana Department of Education initiated the process of developing the Unsafe School Choice Option Policy by meeting with a sub-committee of the Indiana Safe Schools Advisory Council, which included representatives from LEAs and law enforcement. Since that meeting the Department has developed a draft Unsafe School Choice policy with consideration of the recommendations of the sub-committee and the leadership of the Indiana Department of Education. The Department is determining the specific violent crimes that fit the criteria for an individual student to exercise the school choice option. The Department is also determining what data will be used to assess schools for the “persistently dangerous school” designation and the levels that will be used for each data point. Once these determinations have been made and the leadership of the Indiana Department of Education approve the recommendations, the Indiana’s Unsafe School Choice Option policy will be adopted.

**c. ESEA Program Specific Assurances****1. Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs**

Assurance that:

- a. The State plan for the implementation of Title I, Part A was developed in consultation with LEAs, teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, administrators, other staff and parents and that the plan for Title I, Part A coordinates with other programs under this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- b. The SEA has a plan for assisting LEAs and schools to develop capacity to comply with program operation and for providing additional educational assistance to students needing help to achieve State standards, including:
  - i. the use of schoolwide programs;
  - ii. steps to ensure that both schoolwide program- and targeted assisted program schools have highly qualified staff (section 1111);
  - iii. ensuring that assessments results are used by LEAs, schools, and teachers to improve achievement (section 1111);
  - iv. use of curricula aligned with state standards (section 1111);
  - v. provision of supplemental services, including a list of approved service providers and standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services (section 1116);
  - vi. choice and options (section 1116);
  - vii. the state support system under section 1117; and
  - viii. teacher and paraprofessional qualifications (section 1119).

- c. The State has a strategy for ensuring that children served by Title I, Part A will be taught the same knowledge and skills in other subjects and held to the same expectations as all children.
  - d. The State will implement the accountability requirements of section 1116(f) regarding schools identified for improvement prior to the passage of NCLB.
  - e. The State will implement the provisions of section 1116 regarding LEAs and schools in improvement and corrective action.
  - f. The State will produce and disseminate an annual State Report Card in accordance with section 1111(h)(1) and will ensure that LEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds produce and disseminate annual local Report Cards in accordance with section 1111(h)(2).
  - g. The SEA will ensure that LEAs will annually assess English skills for all limited-English proficient students.
  - h. The SEA will coordinate with other agencies that provide services to children, youth and families to address factors that have significantly affected the achievement of students.
  - i. The SEA will ensure that assessment results are promptly provided to LEAs, schools, and teachers.
  - j. The State will participate in State academic assessments of 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and mathematics under NAEP if the Secretary pays the cost of administering such assessments, and will ensure that schools drawn for the NAEP sample will participate in all phases of these assessments, including having results published.
  - k. The SEA, in consultation with the Governor, will produce a plan for carrying out the responsibilities of the State under sections 1116 and 1117, and the SEA's statewide system for technical assistance and support of LEAs.
  - l. The SEA will assist LEAs in developing or identifying high-quality curricula aligned with State academic achievement standards and will disseminate such curricula to each LEA and local school within the State.
  - m. The State will carry out the assurances specified in section 1111(c).
2. Title I, Part B – Even Start Family Literacy
- Assurance that:
- a. The SEA will meet its indicators of program quality developed in section 1240.
  - b. The SEA will help each project under this part to fully implement the program elements described in section 1235, including the monitoring of the projects' compliance with staff qualification requirements and usage of instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research for children and adults.
  - c. The SEA collaborated with early childhood specialists, adult education specialists, and others at the State and local level with interests in family literacy in the development and implementation of this plan.
3. Title I, Part C – Education of Migrant Children
- Assurance that:
- In addition to meeting the seven program assurances in Section 1304(c), the SEA will ensure that:

- a. Special educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children, are identified and addressed through – (a) the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs; (b) joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migrant children, including language instruction educational programs under part A or B of title III; and (c) the integration of services available under this part with services provided by those other programs, a (d) measurable program goals and outcomes.
  - b. State and its local operating agencies will identify and address the special educational needs of migratory children in accordance with a comprehensive State plan as specified in section 1306 (a).
  - c. State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records in a manner consistent with procedures the Secretary may require.
4. Title I, Part D – Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk Assurance that the SEA:
- a. Will ensure that programs will be carried out in accordance with the State plan.
  - b. Will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 1431.
  - c. Has collaborated with parents, correctional facilities, local education agencies, public and private business and other state and federal technical and vocational programs in developing and implementing its plan to meet the educational needs of neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.
  - d. Conducts a process to award Subpart 2 subgrants, to programs operated by local education agencies and correctional facilities.
  - e. Will integrate programs and services for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth with other programs under this Act or other Acts.
5. Title I, Part F – Comprehensive School Reform Assurance that the SEA will:
- a. Fulfill all requirements relating to the competitive subgranting of program funds.
  - b. Awards subgrants of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support the initial costs of the program.
  - c. Award subgrants renewable for 2 additional one year periods if the school is making substantial progress.
  - d. Consider the equitable distribution of subgrants to different geographic regions in the State, including urban and rural areas and to schools serving elementary and secondary students.
  - e. Reserve not more than five (5) percent of grant funds for administrative, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.
  - f. Use funds to supplement, and not supplant, any other funds that would otherwise be available to carry out these activities.
  - g. Report subgrant information, including names of LEAs and schools, amount of award, and description of award.
  - h. Provide a copy of the State's annual program evaluation.

6. Title II, Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund  
Assurance that:
  - a. The SEA will take steps to ensure compliance with the requirements for “professional development” as the term is defined in section 9101(34).
  - b. All funded activities will be developed collaboratively and based on the input of teachers, principals, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.
  - c. The SEA will implement the provisions for technical assistance and accountability in section 2141 with regard to any LEA that has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years.
7. Title II, Part D – Enhanced Education Through Technology  
Assurance that the SEA:
  - a. Will ensure that each subgrant awarded under section 2412 (a)(2)(B) is of sufficient size and duration, and that the program funded by the subgrant is of sufficient scope and quality, to carry out the purposes of this part effectively.
  - b. Has in place a State Plan for Educational Technology that meets all of the provisions of section 2413 of ESEA.
8. Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement  
Assurance that:
  - a. Subgrantees will be required to use their subgrants to build their capacity to continue to provide high-quality language instruction educational programs for LEP students once the subgrants are no longer available.
  - b. The State will consult with LEAs, education-related community groups and non-profit organizations, parents, teachers, school administrators, and researchers in developing annual measurable student achievement objectives for subgrantees.
  - c. Each subgrantee will include in its plan a certification that all teachers in a Title III language instruction educational program for limited English proficient children are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction.
  - d. In awarding subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a recent significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant students, the State will equally consider eligible entities that have limited or no experience in serving immigrant children and youth, and consider the quality of each local plan.
  - e. Subgrants will be of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality programs.
  - f. Subgrantees will be required to provide for an annual reading or language arts assessment in English of all children who have been in the United States for three or more consecutive years.
  - g. Subgrantees will be required to assess annually the English proficiency of all LEP children.
  - h. A subgrantee plan will not be in violation of any State law, including State constitutional law, regarding the education of LEP children.
  - i. Subgrantee evaluations will be used to determine and improve the effectiveness of subgrantee programs and activities.
  - j. Subgrantee evaluations will include a description of the progress made by children in meeting State academic content and student academic achievement

standards for each of the two years after these children no longer participate in a Title III language instruction educational program.

- k. A subgrantee that fails to make progress toward meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years will be required to develop an improvement plan that will ensure the subgrantee meets those objectives.
  - l. Subgrantees will be required to provide the following information to parents of LEP children selected for participation in a language instruction educational program:
    - 1. How the program will meet the educational needs of their children;
    - 2. Their options to decline to enroll their children in that program or to choose another program, if available;
    - 3. If applicable, the failure of the subgrantee to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives for their children.
  - m. In awarding subgrants, the State will address the needs of school systems of all sizes and in all geographic areas within the State, including school systems with urban and rural schools.
9. Title IV, Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Assurance that:
- a. The State has developed a comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the State educational agency and the chief executive officer of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support activities of local educational agencies under section 4115(b), that comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a), and that otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of this part.
  - b. Activities funded under this program will foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
  - c. The application was developed in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials and others, including the chief executive officer, the chief State school officer, the head of the State alcohol and drug abuse agency, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies, the head of the State child welfare agency, the head of the State board of education, or their designees, and representatives of parents, students, and community-based organizations.
  - d. Funds reserved under section 4112(a) will not duplicate the efforts of the State education agency and local educational agencies with regard to the provisions of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and that those funds will be used to serve populations not normally served by the State educational agencies and local educational agencies and populations that need special services, such as school dropouts, suspended and expelled students, youth in detention centers, runaway or homeless children and youth, and pregnant and parenting youth.
  - e. The State will cooperate with, and assist, the Secretary in conducting data collection as required by section 4122.
  - f. LEAs in the State will comply with the provisions of section 9501 pertaining to the participation of private school children and teachers in the programs and activities under this program.



- g. Funds under this program will be used to increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of funds under this subpart, be made available for programs and activities authorized under this program, and in no case supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds.
  - h. A needs assessment was conducted by the State for drug and violence prevention programs, which shall be based on ongoing State evaluation activities, including data on the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence among youth in schools and communities, including the age of onset, the perception of health risks, and the perception of social disapproval among such youth, the prevalence of protective factors, buffers, or assets and other variables in the school and community identified through scientifically based research.
  - i. The State will develop and implement procedures for assessing and publicly reporting progress toward meeting the performance measures.
  - j. The State application will be available for public review after submission of the application.
  - k. Special outreach activities will be carried out by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to maximize the participation of community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness that provide services such as mentoring programs in low-income communities.
  - l. Funds will be used by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to support, develop, and implement community-wide comprehensive drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities.
  - m. The State will develop a process for review of applications from local educational agencies that includes receiving input from parents.
10. Title IV, Part B – 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers
- Assure that the SEA will:
- a. Write the State application in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials, including the chief State school officer, and other State agencies administering before and after school programs, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations.
  - b. Award subgrants of not less than three years and not more than five years that are of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support high quality, effective programs.
  - c. Fund entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families, and the families of such students.
  - d. Require local applicants to submit a plan describing how community learning centers to be funded through this grant will continue after the grant period.
  - e. Require local applicants to describe in their applications how the transportation needs of participating students will be addressed.

11. Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs

Assure that:

- a. The State has set forth the allocation of funds required to implement section 5142 (participation of children enrolled in private schools).
- b. The State has made provision for timely public notice and public dissemination of the information concerning allocations of funds required to implement provisions for assistance to students attending private schools.
- c. Apart from providing technical and advisory assistance and monitoring compliance with this part, the SEA has not exercised, and will not exercise, any influence in the decision making processes of LEAs as to the expenditure made pursuant to the LEAs' application for program funds submitted under section 5133.

## **Appendix A**

Application for Competitive Grants  
under Title VI, Subpart I, Section 6112:  
Enhanced Assessment Instruments

*(to be submitted September 15, 2002)*

## APPENDIX B

### Indiana Department of Education Even Start

#### FY03 Panel Review Rating Instrument

All panelists will receive training prior to reviewing and rating proposals. The purpose of the training is to make you familiar and comfortable with the overall review process as well as with the rating instrument. As much as possible, please make certain any questions have been answered before you begin. Facilitators will be available during the review and rating process, however, for further consultation as the need arises.

This rating instrument follows the same outline as was given applicants for use in developing their Even Start proposals. This correlation was intended to make the rating instrument as easy to use as possible. As you begin the proposal review, feel free to make any initial notes which might help you assess a proposal's quality or which might be important for review team discussion, directly on your proposal copy itself. Comments/questions which are relevant to the numerical ratings assigned, ultimately should be transferred to the rating instrument in the space provided.

The numerical ratings and key comments/questions of all panelists will be summarized for each proposal at the end of the review process. These summaries, as well as the rating instruments themselves, may be shared with applicants upon their request. Reviewers will remain anonymous to applicants with reference to scores and review comments.

Reviewer's Name:

Date of Review:

Applicant/Fiscal Agent:

Partner Applicant(s):

#### Summary of Rating

Proposal Planning Process	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 20 pts)
Need for the Project	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 30 pts)
Project Design and Services	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 40 pts)
Family-Focused Education Services	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 40 pts)
Administration and Staffing	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 20 pts)
Collaboration and Coordination	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 40 pts)
Evaluation and Likelihood of Success	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 25 pts)
Budget and Collaborative Support	_____ Pts. (Maximum: 35 pts)
<b>Total Points Awarded By Reviewer</b>	<b>_____ Pts. (Maximum: 250 pts)</b>

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature of Reviewer*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

## Even Start Panel Review Rating Instrument

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>I. Abstract</b> (no rating needed)	
<b>II. Table of Contents</b> (no rating needed)	
<b>III. Proposal Planning Process:</b> <i>The proposal provides evidence of active local involvement in the development of the project. (20 points possible)</i>	
<p>A. The proposal reflects <b>broad-based community input and participation</b> in the planning of the proposal.</p> <p>___ Broad-based representation involved in planning, <i>e.g., education, health, housing, nutrition, employment, etc.</i></p> <p>___ Involvement included <b>A</b>key players@with decision-making authority</p> <p>___ Adequate advanced notice of public meeting</p> <p>___ Evidence that <b>A</b>community input@was considered</p> <p>___ Evidence of collaboration throughout proposal development</p>	_____ of 10 possible pts.
<p>B. The proposal clearly demonstrates that this proposed Even Start project is <b>part of a larger</b>, local community or school <b>reform effort</b>.</p> <p>___ Describes existing initiatives that focus on the family</p> <p>___ Utilized existing planning structures in proposal development</p> <p>___ Partners have collaborated on other initiatives</p> <p>___ Evidence of common goals and objectives with other community/school initiatives</p>	_____ of 10 possible pts.
<b>TOTAL Points Assigned: Proposal Planning Process</b>	(Maximum: 20 pts.)

Comments on Proposal Planning Process:

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>IV. Need for the Project:</b> <i>The proposal demonstrates that the area to be served has a high percentage or a large number of families in need of Even Start services and that such needs can not be otherwise fully addressed by existing providers. (30 points possible)</i>	
<p>A-1. The proposal provides <b>evidence</b> of high levels of poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, limited English proficiency, homelessness, school failures, or other <b>need-related indicators for the families/area targeted by the project</b>.</p> <p>___ Use of multiple sources of data</p> <p>___ Use of current data, preferably 1990 or later</p> <p>___ Use of existing sources of data, e.g., Step Ahead data, school assessment information.</p> <p>___ Use of locally-generated data</p> <p>___ Data relates to adults, children and family needs</p>	<p>_____ of 5 possible pts.</p>
<p>A-2. Proposal targets families residing in a <b>designated empowerment zone</b>.</p> <p>___ Yes (award 1 point)</p> <p>___ No (award 0 points)</p>	<p>_____ of 1 possible pt.</p>
<p>B-1. The applying partners demonstrate a <b>Aworking knowledge® of existing services</b> and understand how the proposed project will fit into the overall scheme of services available in their community.</p> <p>___ Address relationship to other federal, state and local programs serving the targeted population, i.e., adults with limited literacy skills who are parents of young children</p> <p>___ Address relationship to existing services for all primary components, i.e., adult education, early childhood education and parenting support</p> <p>___ Address relationship to full range of existing services meeting relevant family support needs, e.g., child care, vocational education, employment, special education, food &amp; clothing, health care, counseling, etc.</p>	<p>_____ of 6 possible pts.</p>
<p>B-2. The proposal clearly demonstrates how <b>Even Start will enhance existing services</b> for targeted families, to address unmet or under-met needs. <i>(Refer to the chart of existing services required as an attachment.)</i></p> <p>___ Demonstrates clear understanding of <b>Agaps®</b> in existing services</p> <p>___ Project clearly extends or enhances existing services</p> <p>___ Project does not supplant or duplicate existing services</p> <p>___ Approach to linking services is logical and reasonable</p>	<p>_____ of 6 possible pts.</p>

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<p>C-1. The proposal clearly defines the project's <b>targeted</b> population as those <b>most-in-need</b> of services.</p> <p>___ Proposal was clear in its description of its targeted population as follows:</p> <p>Targeted parents are:</p> <p>Targeted children are:</p> <p>___ Data support targeted parents are those most-in-need, e.g., illiteracy rates, teen parent data, dropout rates, limited English proficiency, under/unemployed data, IMPACT data</p> <p>___ Data support targeted children are those most-in-need, e.g., lack of preschool opportunities, transition to kindergarten issues, retention data for primary grades</p> <p>___ Data support targeted families are those most-in-need, e.g., living in poverty, single parent families, welfare families, homeless families</p>	<p>___ of 7 possible pts.</p>
<p>C-2. The <b>age range of the children</b> targeted by the project is clearly defined, includes <b>at least three years</b>, and is <b>reasonable</b> given the need indicators.</p> <p>___ No, the age range does not include at least three years (assign 0 points)</p> <p>___ Yes, the age range includes at least three years. Assign up to 2 points based on....</p> <p>___ The age range of the children seem reasonable given the established need</p> <p>___ The age range of the children seems reasonable given the partners involved</p>	<p>___ of 2 possible pts.</p>
<p>C-3. The estimated <b>number</b> of targeted families <b>to be served</b> by the project each year seems reasonable and efficient.</p> <p>___ Reasonable given the level of need established.</p> <p>___ Reasonable given the budget and staffing plan</p> <p>___ Will increase or at least be maintained each program year</p> <p>___ Proposed participation adequate to meet Performance Indicator for Participation, <i>i.e., 15+ families per site</i></p>	<p>___ of 3 possible pts.</p>
<b>TOTAL Points Assigned: Need for the Project</b>	(Maximum: 30 pts.)

Comments on Need for the Project:

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>V. Project Design and Services:</b> <i>The proposed project provides for a project plan that will target, recruit and retain the intended population for whom this program is designed. (40 pts possible)</i>	
<p>A. The proposal describes the <b>location(s) and schedule(s) for services</b> that will help facilitate an effective program for the targeted population.</p> <p>___ Center-based location(s) is/are accessible and/or transportation provided</p> <p>___ Location(s) is/are convenient for the targeted families</p> <p>___ Number of hours scheduled are adequate for impact on family learning</p> <p>___ Direct instructional time for <b>adult education</b> involves a minimum of <b>5 hours per week</b> for center-based programs: ___ hrs. per wk. allotted</p> <p>___ Direct instructional time for <b>early childhood education</b> involves a minimum of <b>7 hours per week</b> for center-based programs: ___ hrs. per wk. allotted</p> <p>___ Direct instructional time for <b>parenting support</b> and <b>PACT activities</b> involves a minimum of <b>5 hours per week</b> for center-based programs: ___ hrs. per wk. allotted</p> <p>___ Schedule reflects an understanding of how program components are inter-related, e.g., <i>logical sequence of adult education and parenting activities</i></p> <p>___ Schedule will facilitate component integration and joint activities</p>	<p>___ of 8 possible pts.</p>
<p>B. For new programs, a <b>start-up period</b> will be well-used to organize and initiate an effective program.</p> <p>___ Beginning and ending dates for the start-up period are specified</p> <p>___ Specific activities for the start-up period are described</p> <p>___ Time and staff paid by Even Start appear to be well-used during the start-up period</p> <p>___ No obvious omissions of major activities that would be necessary to accomplish during an initial program start-up</p>	<p>___ of 2 possible pts.</p> <p><i>(Award 2 pts. to existing Even Start programs that are re-applying)</i></p>
<p>C-1. The proposal describes the activities for <b>identifying and recruiting</b> targeted families</p> <p>___ Utilizes a variety of strategies, including face-to-face and word-of-mouth efforts</p> <p>___ Designed to be especially appealing to targeted parents</p> <p>___ Describes <u>specific</u> strategies, not simply general P.R./marketing</p> <p>___ Includes the use of key community partners</p> <p>___ Identifies how eligibility will be prioritized for enrollment</p>	<p>___ of 5 possible pts</p>
<p>C-2. Specific strategies are included for <b>retaining families in program</b> to ensure duration of services to meet families' needs.</p> <p>___ Incorporates ways to build rapport with families and an <i>esprit de corps</i> within the program are incorporated</p> <p>___ Incorporates ways to network with other Even Start families and/or garner support from collaborating agencies/programs are incorporated</p> <p>___ Incorporates follow-up on attendance problems and/or family crises</p> <p>___ An incentive system is described that will seem attractive to participating families</p>	<p>___ of 5 possible pts</p>



Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>D. Screening and preparation</b> of participating parents and children <input type="checkbox"/> Includes an assessment of the educational needs of family members <input type="checkbox"/> Includes an assessment of the support needs of the family <input type="checkbox"/> Results in jointly-written long- and short-term family goals ( <i>e.g., family plan</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> Specific strategy/ies to ensure parent commitment to full participation in the program as part of enrollment procedures, <i>e.g., trial enrollment period</i>	     _____ of 5 possible pts
<b>E. Provision of support services</b> to encourage/allow family participation and retention in program, <i>e.g., child care, counseling, housing assistance, health services</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates an understanding of the target population's needs <input type="checkbox"/> Addresses unique issues or needs of the targeted families, resulting in a design that is likely to be attractive to the targeted families <input type="checkbox"/> Addresses particular barriers facing targeted families <input type="checkbox"/> Provides for flexibility to meet the changing needs of families <input type="checkbox"/> Includes strategies that support full and sustained participation <input type="checkbox"/> Includes a referral network responsive to the needs of the targeted families <input type="checkbox"/> Includes comprehensive case management services	     _____ of 5 possible pts
<b>F. Year-round activities</b> will continue contact with and support of families throughout the calendar year. <input type="checkbox"/> Summer services include instructional services sufficient to meet the Performance Indicator for Year Round Services <input type="checkbox"/> Social and/or recreational activities are incorporated throughout the program year <input type="checkbox"/> The design for summer activities is likely to be attractive to targeted families	    _____ of 5 possible pts
<b>G. Program design features will support family transition</b> from the Even Start program to other educational, work and/or community endeavors. <input type="checkbox"/> Specific strategies target development of the adult learners' employability skills ( <i>Cross-reference Section VI-A</i> ) <input type="checkbox"/> Planned connections with post-secondary opportunities, <i>e.g., IVY Tech, local colleges</i> appear viable for the targeted adults <input type="checkbox"/> There are school-to-work strategies incorporated to support adult familiarity with the work world and its expectations <input type="checkbox"/> There are activities to support children's transition to school	    _____ of 5 possible pts
<b>TOTAL Points Assigned: Project Design and Services</b>	<div style="border: 3px double black; padding: 5px; text-align: center;">             (Maximum: 40 pts.)           </div>

Comments on Project Design and Services:

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>VI. Family-Focused Education Services:</b> <i>The proposed project includes high quality adult education, early childhood education, parenting support and literacy-based Parent-and-Child-Together activities in cohesive education services. (40 pts possible)</i>	
<p>A. Instructional approaches for <b>adult education</b></p> <p>___ Direct instructional time for adult education involves a <b>minimum of 5 hours per week</b> (<i>center-based programs</i>)          ___ <i>Number of hours per week</i></p> <p>___ Includes academic, life and work skill preparation in ways that are appropriate and relevant to adult learners</p> <p>___ Utilize adult-oriented curriculum, materials and approaches</p> <p>___ Reflect current best practices for adult education, <i>e.g., mix of grouping strategies, writing, life relevant tasks</i></p> <p>___ Specific curricular approach name or described in detail</p> <p>___ Integrate assessment, curriculum and instruction</p> <p>___ Build on existing services</p> <p>___ (<i>Teen Education programs only</i>) Specifies what aspects of the educational program will be provided by the LEA: <b>must include the core elements for a high school diploma</b></p>	<p>___ of 11 possible pts.</p>
<p>B. Instructional approaches for <b>early childhood education</b></p> <p>___ Direct instructional time for <b>early childhood education</b> involves a <b>minimum of 7 hours per week</b> for center-based programs: ___ <i>hrs. per wk. allotted</i></p> <p>___ Includes both age-appropriate and individual child-appropriate activities</p> <p>___ Describe a specific and appropriate curriculum for age group(s) targeted, <i>e.g., High/Scope, a fully-describe, locally developed model</i></p> <p>___ Includes adequate details to communicate what the instructional program or instructional day will be like</p> <p>___ Service(s) appropriately fit the age(s) of children served; rationale supports the design of services for each age group</p> <p>___ Integrate assessment, curriculum and instruction</p> <p>___ Build on existing services</p>	<p>___ of 11 possible pts.</p>
<p>C. Instructional approaches for <b>parent support and parent/child interaction</b></p> <p>___ Direct instructional time for <b>parenting support</b> and <b>PACT activities</b> involves a <b>minimum of 5 hours per week</b> for center-based programs: <i>hrs. per wk. allotted</i></p> <p>___ Parenting support design is sensitive and relevant to the needs of targeted families</p> <p>___ Curriculum, at least in part, will be driven by parent and child needs/interests</p> <p>___ PACT activities emphasize literacy</p> <p>___ Both adult and early childhood educators are involved in parenting and/or PACT</p> <p>___ Are not isolated exercises but integrated into all program components, <i>i.e., preliminary modeling and/or follow-up discussions are planned to fully explain or enhance the purposes of the activities</i></p>	<p>___ of 11 possible pts.</p>

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
___ Build on existing services	
D. <b>Home-based</b> instructional services ___ Description provides clear purposes and a clear picture of the home services to be provided ___ Have clearly stated instructional purposes and involve literacy activities ___ Are provided at least monthly for a minimum of 30-minutes in center-based programs and weekly for a minimum of 90 minutes for home-based programs ___ Involve a number of staff including adult and early childhood educators ___ Involve staff caseloads of no more than 10-12 families per week for a home-based program ___ Adapt to the family environment and real world issues	          ____ of 7 possible pts.
<b>TOTAL Points Assigned:</b> <b>Family-Focused Education Services</b>	(Maximum: 40 pts.)

Comments on Family-Focused Education Services:

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>VII. Administration and Staffing Plan:</b> <i>The proposal reflects the administrative and staff support necessary for the project's successful implementation (20 points possible)</i>	
<b>A. Staffing plan</b> and personnel requirements clearly support the effective implementation/administration of the program design as outlined. <i>(Refer to the narrative and related attachments)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and reasonable staffing pattern <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate hours for planning and coordinating the program, considering program size and complexity <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate direct-line program staff to support all project components <input type="checkbox"/> Qualified staff based upon resumes and/or job descriptions <input type="checkbox"/> <i>(For new applicants)</i> Job descriptions/staff resumes verify that staff meet the minimum qualifications required in the law	_____ of 7 possible pts
<b>B. Staff development</b> and training opportunities <input type="checkbox"/> Include multiple approaches with options for whole staff, component-specific, and individual development <input type="checkbox"/> Provide for some cross-training of staff in adult and early childhood education <input type="checkbox"/> Begin prior to delivering services to families <input type="checkbox"/> Are planned regularly throughout the year <input type="checkbox"/> Are cohesive, comprehensive and focused <input type="checkbox"/> Include staff input in planning and delivery of activities	_____ of 5 possible pts
<b>C. The applying partnership</b> describes <b>proper administration</b> of the project, including the management of funds and facilities, the hiring, supervision and development of staff and responding to the necessary reporting and implementation requirements. <input type="checkbox"/> Responsible contact person designated by each applying partner <input type="checkbox"/> Responsibilities for direct coordination of staff and project activities are clearly assigned <input type="checkbox"/> Responsibilities for fiscal management are clearly assigned <input type="checkbox"/> Responsibilities for program accountability are clearly assigned	_____ of 8 possible pts
<b>TOTAL Points Assigned:</b> <b>Administration and Staffing Plan</b>	(Maximum: 20 pts.)

Comments on Administration and Staffing Plan:

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>VIII. Collaboration and Coordination:</b> <i>There is evidence that coordination and collaboration will take place in all phases of the project. (30 points possible)</i>	
<p>A. The letter of understanding between the <b>applying partners</b> reflects that both partners <b>have made significant commitments</b> to the project and that each expects to benefit from this relationship</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Each has a clear and meaningful role in the project</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> There are clear and meaningful benefits from the partnership</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Each has a clear stake in the projects success</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A multiple-year commitment is evident</p>	_____ of 8 possible pts
<p>B-1. Even Start funds are being used to <b>build on and not duplicate services</b> already provided by the applying partners and/or other service providers</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Existing services are being utilized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Existing services are being enhanced/expanded</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A broad range of working relationships exists with collaborators, <i>e.g., planning, referral, in-kind support, cash support and joint services</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration and coordination will be supported/enhanced through regular and on-going process/contact</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A variety of agencies that serve different types of family needs, <i>e.g. alliances in health, social services, counseling, job training or placement</i> are involved</p>	_____ of 8 possible pts
B-2. There is evidence that applying partners have entered into <b>clear, meaningful, firm agreements with other providers</b> for cooperative activities.	
B-2a. Written coordination agreements exist with community partners contributing to the local match. <input type="checkbox"/> All (4 pts.) <input type="checkbox"/> None (0 pts) <input type="checkbox"/> Some (1-3 pts.)	_____ of 4 possible pts
B-2b. Written agreements exist with <u>at least one</u> major funding source for early childhood education, <i>e.g., Title I, Head Start</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 pts.) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 pts)	_____ of 3 possible pts
B-2c. Written agreements exist with <u>at least one</u> major funding source for adult education/training, <i>e.g., Adult Education act, Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), Vocational Education (secondary or post-secondary)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 pts.) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 pts)	_____ of 3 possible pts
B-2d. Written agreements substantiate meaningful collaboration and coordination not simply interest and general support for the Even Start efforts	_____ of 3 possible pts
<p>C-1. <b>Collaboration and coordination with other programs and agencies</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Offer key support necessary for accomplishing the Even Start Program objectives</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Involve those with decision-making power and/or control of <del>A</del>mainstream funds</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Will support/enhance the cooperative relationship through regular and on-going contact or process</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Involve a variety of agencies that serve different types of family needs, <i>e.g., alliances in health, social services, counseling, job training or placement services</i></p>	_____ of 4 possible pts

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<p>C-2. Coordination with <b>Programs for Individuals with Special Needs</b></p> <p>___ Coordination support includes agencies whose primary focus is meeting special needs</p> <p>___ Special needs (and coordination with agencies to provide needed support) are addressed in the screening process and throughout the program.</p> <p>___ Program has planned specific coordinated services/activities with other federally-funded programs, <i>e.g., Title I, Special Education</i></p> <p>___ Program has planned specific coordinated services/activities with relevant programs funded under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Act and the Workforce Investment Act</p> <p>___ Program has planned specific coordination activities/services with Head Start and other literacy-relevant programs in the community.</p>	<p>___ of 3 possible pts</p>
<p>C-3. Specific ideas exist for building relationships which will <b>move the project toward sustained programming</b> as Even Start dollars reduce, and for <b>supporting the transition of children and parents from Even Start</b> as their participation goals and objectives are realized.</p> <p>___ Specific mechanism established to build collaborative support, <i>e.g., advisory council, community outreach plan, public relations plan</i></p> <p>___ Relationships are/will be established that support adults as they transition to work, training or post-secondary education</p> <p>___ Relationships are/will be established that support young children as they transition to other preschool or to K-12 schooling</p>	<p>___ of 4 possible pts</p>
<p><b>TOTAL Points Assigned: Collaboration and Coordination</b></p>	<p>(Maximum: 40 pts.)</p>

Comments on Collaboration and Coordination:

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>IX. Evaluation and Likelihood of Success:</b> <i>The proposal shows promise of success as a demonstration project which might be transferable and used by others. (25 pts. Possible)</i>	
<p>A. The proposal states <b>clear, relevant, measurable impact objectives</b> relating to the three stated goals of Even Start, against which the progress and success of the project can be measured.</p> <p>___ There is at least <u>one</u> clearly stated objective for each of the three Even Start goals:</p> <p>___ To increase parents= literacy</p> <p>___ To prepare children for success as learners in the regular school program</p> <p>___ To help parents support the educational growth of their children</p> <p><b>If NO, assign 0 points; If YES, use the following indicators:</b></p> <p>___ Objectives are measurable</p> <p>___ Objectives are reasonable and meaningful for the targeted population</p> <p>___ Progress toward objectives can be assessed within the program year</p>	<p>___ of 6 possible pts</p>
<p>B. The proposal describes a local evaluation plan which <b>effectively utilizes internal evaluation activities</b> to measure progress and success in achieving program objectives and to make program refinements.</p> <p>___ Strategies for data collection, summary and analysis are described</p> <p>___ Project staff are clearly involved in program evaluation, <i>e.g., collecting and analyzing data to make program decisions and refinements</i></p> <p>___ Internal evaluation activities will consider quantitative and qualitative information</p> <p>___ Internal evaluation activities include on-going formative assessment and program refinement, including 2 or more checkpoints during the calendar year</p> <p>___ Specific procedures for reviewing and using the data to refine the program are described</p> <p>___ Evaluation activities include summative assessment at the end of the year</p>	<p>___ of 6 possible pts</p>
<p>C. The proposal describes an <b>external evaluation plan</b> to independently evaluate the program= progress and success in achieving program objectives and to make program refinements.</p> <p>___ Evaluation activities will include:</p> <p>___ Quantitative and qualitative information</p> <p>___ Commendations and recommendations based on the program= data</p> <p>___ The external evaluator= qualifications include:</p> <p>___ prior evaluation experience relevant to adult, early childhood, and/or parenting support/education</p> <p>___ knowledge and experience in both quantitative and qualitative evaluation</p> <p>___ experience in a practitioner-oriented= approach to evaluation, <i>e.g., focusing on information useful in making program decisions and refinements</i></p> <p>___ Relationship with the applying partners would be independent and objective</p>	<p>___ of 6 possible pts</p>
<p>D. The proposal provides objective evidence that the <b>applying partners have had past success</b> in operating family-focused education, adult education, early childhood education and/or parenting support or parenting education programs.</p> <p>___ Evidence includes objective data</p> <p>___ Evidence addresses each of the partners= past successes</p> <p>___ Evidence addresses success with similar programming or similar families/family members</p>	<p>___ of 5 possible pts</p>

Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
E. <b>Features that can be adopted/adapted</b> by others interested in family literacy ___ Relevant features that could be replicated by other interested communities are described ___ The programs design is unique enough to address local and targeted families=needs, but feasible for adoption/adaptation in other communities	___ of 2 possible pt
<b>TOTAL Points Assigned: Evaluation and Likelihood of Success</b>	(Maximum: 25 pts.)

Comments on Evaluation and Likelihood of Success:



Proposal Narrative	Points Assigned
<b>Budget and Collaborative Support:</b> <i>The budget for the proposed project appears reasonable and demonstrates collaborative support from the applying partnership and the community. (35 points possible)</i>	
A. The first year budget along with cost estimates provided for years 2 through 4 demonstrate <b>local support</b> for the project <b>that meets or exceeds the required match</b> by 5% or more, as follows: 15%+ in Year 1; 25%+ in Year 2; 35%+ in Year 3; 45%+ in Year 4    ___ Yes (2 pts)    ___ No (0 pts)	___ of 2 possible pts
B. <b>Summary budget</b> ___ Appears reasonable given the scope of the program described in this proposal ___ Includes on line items and costs that have been clearly documented in the narrative sections of this proposal, <i>i.e., no surprises</i> ___ All expected costs are included in the budget summary; it does not appear that there are any omissions ___ Matching contributions pay for some of the salaries	___ of 10 possible pts
C. <b>Program costs are described clearly</b> outlined in sufficient detail and appear reasonable given the scope of the project and its intended outcomes.	
C-1. <b>Staff salaries and fringe benefit costs are described clearly</b> and appear to be appropriate and relevant for the program design described in the proposal narrative.	___ of 4 possible pts
C-2. <b>Travel, equipment and supply costs</b> are clearly described and appear to be appropriate and relevant for the program design described in the proposal narrative.	___ of 4 possible pts
C-3. An <b>explanation is given for how each line item was calculated</b> and cost calculations appear to be based, for the most part, on real figures or educated guesstimates.	___ of 5 possible pts
D. The <b>in-kind and/or cash contributions</b> to the project demonstrate that the applying partners are contributing to the project and are making <b>reasonable and effective use of other community resources</b> . ___ Funds not requested for expenses that could logically be provided in-kind, <i>e.g., existing facilities and existing staff positions</i> ___ In-kind contributions of existing administrative positions, <i>e.g., principals, central office administrators, agency directors</i> , are clearly linked to well-defined and necessary roles within the project ___ Some in-kind match in costs for equipment, supplies and facility costs ___ Some in-kind match in salaries of direct service staff ___ Value of in-kind match appears realistic ___ Commitments from both/all partner applicants evident through contributions ___ Commitments from other collaborators evident through contributions	___ of 10 possible pts
<b>TOTAL Points Assigned:</b> <b>Budget and Collaborative Support</b>	(Maximum: 35 pts.)

Comments on Project Budget and Collaborative Support:

## APPENDIX C

### Professional Development Program Design

#### Instructions

- Form A: Fill in all information completely.
- Form B: The committee responsible for preparing the school's strategic and continuous school improvement and achievement plan (SIP) is also responsible for completing the Professional Development Program. Each member of that committee must sign this form. The "Representing" column refers to the stakeholder group that person is representing such as teacher, parent, community, etc.
- Form C: Answer all questions completely. Do not use less than a ten-point font. Make your answers as concise as possible.
- Form D: Your entire Professional Development Program should address only one to three major school goals. Please use one copy of "Form D" for each school goal from your SIP. You may also wish to establish professional development goals for reaching the school goals.
- Form E: Use one copy of "Form E" to answer these questions for each school goal. If the evidence of success is quantitative, state the numerical goals to you hope to attain.
- Example: The anticipated result of this professional development will be that 75% of teachers are effectively using the Four Block literacy approach by the end of the second year of training.
- Form F: List all sources of professional development funds available to your school. This should include general fund appropriations, grants, partnership contributions, etc. If your school has a grant issued specifically to your school, list it under school sources. If your corporation has a grant for all schools, list your portion under corporation sources.

In accordance with **IC 20-1-1-6.5(l)(1)** your Professional Development Program should have the following characteristics:

1. is school based and collaboratively designed, and encourages participants to work collaboratively.
2. has a primary focus on state and local academic standards, including a focus on Core 40 subject areas.
3. enables teachers to improve expertise in subject knowledge and teaching strategies, uses of technologies, and other essential elements in teaching to high standards.
4. furthers the alignment of standards, curriculum, and assessments.
5. includes measurement activities to ensure the transfer of new knowledge and skills to classroom instruction.

**Be sure your Professional Development Program addresses these five areas.**

## DEFINITIONS

<b>SIP</b>	Abbreviation for the strategic and continuous school improvement and achievement plan as stated in IC 20-1-1-6.3(b).
<b>PDP</b>	Abbreviation for Professional Development Program as stated in IC 20-1-1-6.5.
<b>Activity</b>	Professional development experiences such as study groups, curriculum groups, peer coaching, workshops and their follow-up, etc. that are identified as effective activities in the research on principles of effective professional development.
<b>Evaluation</b>	Quantitative and qualitative data that gauge the impact of your Professional Development Program and guide your progress toward reaching your school goal.
<b>Goal from SIP</b>	Those goals identified in the school's plan and are stated in terms such that progress toward the goals can be determined.
<b>Professional Development Goal</b>	The ideal changes that need to occur in stakeholders' knowledge, skills, and attitudes toward learning that lead to increased student achievement.
<b>Stakeholders</b>	"...Persons interested in the school, including administrators, teachers, parents, and community and business leaders..." IC 20 10.2-3-1

## **Indiana State Board of Education**

### **Core Professional Development Principles**

1. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS WILL ADDRESS ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THE PRIORITIES OF EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT AND REFLECT THE KNOWLEDGE BASE OF THE PROFESSION BY:
  - A. reflecting research-based approaches to effective adult learning, student learning, and organizational change to support on-going developmental activities. While tapping educators' life experiences and drawing on the knowledge base from effective research, a variety of modes of learning are used to foster self-directed professional development opportunities.
  - B. integrating education improvement priorities. Consistent and continuous links are made with the School Improvement Plan, the Indiana Professional Standards Board, and Indiana State Board of Education policy.
  - C. incorporating both discipline-specific and interdisciplinary approaches to teaching, assessment, and preparation for the world of work. Professional growth experiences enhance educators' knowledge within and across subject areas and their ability to foster and assess students' problem solving and critical thinking skills.
  - D. including explicit strategies for setting high expectations and meeting the diverse learning needs of all students. Training activities increase educators' capacity to implement developmentally appropriate practices to establish challenging learning goals and respond to the uniqueness of each student.
  - E. receiving adequate resources. Every public school in Indiana must receive the financial resources and support services needed to provide the most effective Professional Development Program, as described within these principles.
- II. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM WILL ENGAGE EDUCATORS IN AN EFFECTIVE LEARNING PROCESS THAT IMPACTS PRACTICE BY:
  - A. actively involving participants in program design, delivery, and implementation. Professional growth opportunities reflect educators' needs as determined from multiple data sources grounded in and linked with the School Improvement Plan. All stakeholders shall be engaged in meaningful job-embedded opportunities to effectively support practice, which leads to improved student learning.
  - B. promoting multiple strategies that model recommended strategies. Opportunities for professional development incorporate varied approaches such as theory, demonstration, reflection, practice, mentoring, technology applications, and peer dialogue.
  - C. incorporating follow-up activities that are sustained over time and provide educators with ongoing feedback. The Professional Development Program provides a range of opportunities for staff to integrate the new strategies into their work with children through practice, feedback, and reflection.

### **CORE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES (cont'd)**

- D. continuously evaluating impact on educator's practice and student learning. The effectiveness of professional development is determined by its impact on staff performance and student learning.

### **III PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS WILL CONTRIBUTE TO DEVELOPING AN ENVIRONMENT THAT SUPPORTS EDUCATORS' PROFESSIONAL GROWTH BY:**

- A. fostering collegiality and collaboration. Professional growth opportunities encourage staff to build a community of educators, parents, business, and community partners who exchange ideas for innovation, cooperate in developing curricula, and discuss approaches to strengthening student learning by focusing on the school community as a "culture of inquiry".
- B. building capacity through a continuum of ongoing improvement activities. Professional development activities maintain a focus on the improvement of practices that increase student learning and link to the School Improvement Plan and the standards developed by the Indiana Professional Standards Board, and State Board of Education policy.
- C. integrating staff development into educators' practice. The Professional Development Program incorporates supports for staff to implement newly acquired strategies assess them for their impact on student learning.
- D. encouraging innovations and risk-taking. As a result of staff development activities, the school community recognizes the need for action research that assists educators, leading toward innovations improving student learning.

**FORM A**

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

***DUE DATE: 30 JUNE 2002***

**School Information**

**School Name:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**County/Corp/School#** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Street, P.O. Box)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(City, State, Zip)

**Phone:** ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

**Fax:** ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Principal (Include Title):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Principal's e-mail address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Grade levels included in school:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FORM B**

I, \_\_\_\_\_ as the exclusive representative, by signing this document, demonstrate my support for the Professional Development Program submitted by the above-mentioned school.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (typed)

**Committee responsible for this plan.**

Name	Group you are representing:	Signature	Date

**FORM C**

**Narratives:** Please do not use less than a ten-point font. Make your answers as concise as possible and no longer than one page.

1. What is your school's vision toward which this Professional Development Program will lead?  
(The vision may be taken from your school improvement plan or created for this document.)  
*Optional.*



**FORM C (cont'd)**

2. What is (are) the goal(s) of your Professional Development Program?

**FORM C (cont'd)**

3. How will all staff members be involved in continuous learning? How will continuous learning be embedded in practice?

## FORM D

**ACTION PLAN**

School Goal #\_\_\_\_ (from SIP) (The Professional Development Program should be limited to, at most, three school goals. Please use one Form D for each school goal.)

Professional Development Goal (s) (From #2 Form C)

\_\_\_\_\_(Optional)

Research upon which your professional development approach was formulated (Optional)

Activity*	Intended Audience (Stakeholders)	Person Responsible	Collaborative Partners Needed	Time Line (Include completion date)	Resources (People, materials, time)		
						Need	Have

\*See definitions page

Please answer these questions for each school goal from your SIP that your Professional Development Program is addressing.

(The Professional Development Program should be limited to addressing no more than three school goals from your SIP.)

**School Goal #\_\_\_\_\_** From your school improvement plan

Statement of School Goal:

---

---

---

---

- I. Summary of data and evidence upon which this school goal was based.
- II. What new knowledge, skills, and attitudes toward learning will result from your Professional Development Program?
- III. What data and evidence related to new knowledge, skills and attitudes toward learning will you collect to evaluate the Professional Development Program's impact on progress toward this school goal? (NOTE: If the data or evidence are quantitative, state the numerical goal you hope to achieve.)

**FORM F**Total Funds Available for Professional Development: Grants, Gifts, and Appropriation

Federal Sources	Amount	State Sources	Amount	School Corp. Sources	Amount	School Sources Include grants and partnerships	Amount	Total Amount of Each Row
Total each "Amount" column								
Amount Allocated to Professional Development								

**SURVEY INFORMATION**

**The following information is needed by the Indiana Department of Education. It will be used to identify best practices to share with other schools. THE ANSWERS WILL NOT BE PART OF THE SCORING RUBIC FOR YOUR GRANT.**

**Your cooperation in answering these two questions is greatly appreciated.**

**Please limit your answers to one page and do not use less than a ten-point font.**

1. Will time be organized differently in your school to accommodate professional development? If so, how?

Survey Information (cont'd)

2. How will technology be used in your professional development? (This refers to technology used as a delivery system for professional development and/or helping staff use technology in instruction.